

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWICE A CITIZEN AWARD

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday night, Congressman JACK BRINKLEY received the Twice a Citizen Award from the Naval Reserve Association, Atlanta, Ga., Chapter.

What a splendidly captioned award this is.

I am reminded of the painting which hangs in the House of Representatives dining room signed, "C. Brumidi, Artist—Citizen of the U.S." Constantino Brumidi was twice a citizen in the finest sense. Born a citizen of Italy, Brumidi became a naturalized citizen of the United States, and was deeply proud of the fact. Drawn to America by the promise of individual freedom, Brumidi's highest goal was to repay the country which had given him the gift of liberty by designing works of art to help make its Capitol Building the most beautiful on Earth. Brumidi's was an example of excellence for us all, and JACK BRINKLEY has always been one of his greatest admirers.

I wish to submit for the RECORD my good friend JACK's remarks in accepting this prestigious award.

REMARKS BY HON. JACK BRINKLEY
THE BUDGET AND NATIONAL DEFENSE
RECONCILIATION

With Hugh Howell introducing me, I am reminded of a story of a Georgia dairy farmer who wouldn't sell his milk to Carnation Milk Company because of its slogan, "Milk From Contented Cows." When asked why, the farmer replied, "My cows are not contented—they are always trying harder."

Hugh Howell makes that same claim for the Navy Reserve. He says that you are always trying harder and, judging from what Rear Admiral W. D. Daniel, Deputy Chief for Navy Reserves, testified before our subcommittee earlier this year, I know that his claim is valid. It's with pardonable pride that I receive the Twice a Citizen Award this evening. Please accept my deepest appreciation.

After this year I am returning to Georgia following a 16-year sojourn in our nation's capital. In preparing for this speech, I came across something about General Lee as he was going home after the Peace Treaty at Appomattox. . . . On his great mount, Traveler, Lee was returning to Richmond under the escort of the Union Cavalry. The soldiers in blue were there because they felt the chief in gray might need protection from the people he had led for almost 5 years, but his respect had never depended on his title or power and, as he passed former soldiers of the Army of Northern Virginia on his trek to rejoin his family, he

was always greeted by cheers and offers of what little food they had to share.

After awhile, he turned to the Union officer in charge of his escort and thanked him for his service. "But," he said, "you may return to your unit now. For, as you can see, I am in my own country now and among friends."

That expresses my own feelings about home-going, too, with one important difference. In Washington, I have always felt that I was in my own country and among friends.

I hope you also feel that way about it and, if not, I would first like to share with you a brief glimpse from the inside which may provide some encouragement.

First of all, the words "E Pluribus Unum" stand for something—one out of many. One out of many is the fundamental concept incorporated in our Constitution.

An old political cartoon may be recalled from back in the years of Munich by David Low, the British cartoonist. It showed Britain and France in the stern of a boat bailing out a very bad leak, and huddled in the bow of the boat was America and the rest of the world saying, "Thank heavens the ship is not sinking at our end."

We are, in this country, in the same boat together. It flies the stars and stripes, and the rising tide does lift all the boats.

There is a chapel in the Capitol building located between the House and Senate chambers just off the Great Rotunda. My introduction to it was more than a decade ago when I went there accompanied by friends from home.

"The chapel isn't used very much," I lamented. But, the elderly doorkeeper who had come in with us demurred in a kind but definite way. "Oh yes it is, Congressman," he said, "It's used a lot! Look here," he pointed, "at the path . . . in the carpet!"

Well, let me tell you about your man in Congress. If you should ask him, he would tell you—"I don't work for the government; I work for you!"

When Jimmy Carter of my District was elected President, the Members from whose Districts earlier Presidents had come banded together to give me an actual "rubber stamp," an automatic "Aye" vote to be used on Carter bills! In making the presentation early in the President's term, they noted it was something of an irony since I hadn't voted with him yet!

Your Representative might vote differently than you would vote and, under a Constitutional Republic, that's his privilege and responsibility if he sees it that way; but, believe me, he is tuned in to the people back home. It is a bitter-sweet anomaly that the polls on a Representative within his own district are usually very high, while the polls on the Congress as a whole are very low.

Sometimes the votes in Washington are difficult. By way of analogy, a bill may be compared with vegetable soup. A chef can take the finest tomatoes, choicest beef and other special ingredients, combine and cook them perfectly and spoil it all if sand is mistakenly used for salt. Of course, the soup wouldn't be edible and the vote would be "no." The beef people wouldn't like it and the tomato people wouldn't like it, but one small part of the package vitiated all of it.

There is seldom a case where a Representative is 100 percent for or 100 percent against a bill. Many times it is 60-40 or 70-30, and the Member tries to vote for the better of the two choices. That can be especially painful if there is 90 percent good and 10 percent bad, but the bad is the "sand in the soup" case, and you must vote in the negative.

And then, the system is slow. Ladies and gentlemen, that is precisely the way the founding fathers planned it. Think of it! Three branches of government—the executive, the judicial, and legislative; that latter a bicameral body where our committees function as important homerooms for legislative review.

The long hours get frustrating sometimes. I am reminded of Millicent Fenwick, the gentle lady from New Jersey. She is remarkable in so many ways, graceful, fine articulation, smokes a pipe genteelly, but she has something to say on just about any subject that comes down the pike. She always gets her two cents in, and patience sometimes wears thin.

Usually the Millicent Fenwicks of Congress, if not disliked, are just tolerated. Something happened to change my mind about Millicent. I had a bill up from the Veterans Affairs Committee which would eliminate one of the duplicate inspections by VA and HUD on mobile homes. To eliminate this redundancy without sacrificing safety, a bit less than a million dollars a year would be saved. After having presented my case, Millicent Fenwick leaned on the committee table in the House chamber and expressed her delight over such an example where, by taking care of the little things, she said, the larger things would fall into place. You know, I learned to like that lady.

This brings me to my major committee assignment, the Armed Services Committee.

It is in the very middle of the budget debate for fiscal year 1983:

Some recommend that we hold the increase in military spending to the 7 percent annual real growth figure suggested by the President last year:

Under the President's budget, after adjustments for inflation, military spending would increase approximately 13 percent for fiscal 1983; and that's on top of a 9 percent increase for this year.

Members of our Committee have the undeserved reputation of being doctrinaire, automatic aye voters on Pentagon requests. But now, more than ever, we are determined to look behind the labels.

We are committed to a strong national defense which will command the respect of friend and foe alike. We have given the benefit of the doubt to programs concerning which there have been reservations—the MX basing mode, the B-1 bomber, new aircraft carriers with price tags in the billions.

In 1973 I was a lonely voice in calling for a lean and mean North Atlantic Treaty Organization. For fiscal '83 it is time to change gears from the NATO chapter of yesterday to the new Rapid Deployment Force chapter of today—such as I recommended in 1973—to meet our present national interests in the Persian Gulf area. As Chairman of the Military Installations and Facilities

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Subcommittee, with a \$7.8 billion request from the Administration, you may be sure that these matters are undergoing close scrutiny.

Our nuclear strike capacity is awesome. For example, our submarines are quieter and more lethal than any of those of our adversaries. The Trident system now coming into the fleet, standing alone, represents an incredibly strong arm against aggression. One Trident submarine will provide more firepower and target coverage than the entire fleet of 10 Polaris strategic submarines.

U.S.S. *Ohio*, the first Trident submarine, was delivered to the Navy in October 1981 and will deploy in its first deterrent patrol later this year. The second ship of the class, the U.S.S. *Michigan*, will go to sea in June of this year and will be delivered to the Navy in the fall. Each Trident submarine will carry 24 missiles with a range in excess of 4,000 miles. The fiscal year 1983 budget now before the Congress includes funds for the 10th and 11th Trident submarines and projects a force of at least 15 Trident submarines.

Why, then, do we agonize over procurement of all nuclear weapons systems which our minds and imagination may devise?

The simple truth is that a strong defense must be bilateral with a strong economy. Neither may survive alone. A rotten economy will drag down the defense establishment with it.

The defense issue then becomes a matter of priorities. There is strong sentiment among Armed Services Committee Members that our committee, the authorizing committee, make adjustments in the defense bill rather than abdicate the matter of priorities to less-informed Members on the floor by the amendment route, or to the Defense Appropriations Committee.

Many of us feel that the military emphasis today should be on conventional forces and personnel upgrading. No matter how expensive our weaponry, America cannot have a first-class national defense if it ignores the human potential. Any sophisticated machines cannot enhance productivity if we do not have the brain power to engineer them and the trained manpower to operate them.

The bottom line is that the budget is going to be improved and our national defense streamlined. Our goal is to command the respect of friend and foe alike, for we are "... watchmen on the walls of world freedom!"

And, may our motto always be: "My country, in her relations with other countries, may she always be in the right; but, my country right or wrong ... when right to keep it right, and when wrong to put it right!"

WHERE YOUR TAX DOLLARS GO: NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a total disregard for the taxpayers' money, the National Foundation for Arts and Humanities is a perfect example.

I know that very few of my colleagues ever pick up, let alone, read the Federal Register. Perhaps if they just read just one issue, they would get the full impact of why America's economy is in such a sorry state. It becomes particularly nauseating when one picks up and reads day after day, month after month, year after year, those entries under the heading of Arts and Humanities. I thought the practice would be long gone under the Reagan administration, but so far, such is not the case.

In almost every entry where a meeting is announced where money, our money, constituent money, is to be doled out, it is announced that due to the confidentiality of different matters involved, the meeting will be closed to the public. And they admit that honest and straightforward disclosure would probably lead to, "significantly frustrate implementation of proposed agency action."

To this agency, there is no responsibility to account to the taxpayer as to where the money goes. I have often wondered about this and how they get away with it. Well, I wonder no longer, and it is high time that this House cuts off this spigot as well as several others I have discussed today.

For some examples of how this agency has squandered money, I submit just a short page from the *Conservative Digest* of April 1982. It will be interesting to my colleagues and others that their money has been spent praising identified members of the U.S. Communist Party and yes, even a university professor who went to Hanoi, North Vietnam, while our boys were dying to the south. And yes, this individual came back and said the school system in North Vietnam (Communist) was comparable to the school system back in his own hometown. The article, "Arts and Humanities Dollars Bankroll Leftist Groups," follows:

ARTS AND HUMANITIES DOLLARS BANKROLL LEFTIST GROUPS

President Reagan proposed to cut in half the budget of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Instead of saving the taxpayers as much as \$170 million, Congress voted to spend \$143 million for NEA and \$130 million for NEH in 1982—cuts of less than 15 percent from projected Carter levels.

Under Carter NEH appointee Joseph Duffey (former chairman of Americans for Democratic Action) funding of Left groups reached new heights. Here are some examples of liberal organization and their "projects":

SANE education fund, \$115,451 (1979 and 1980 combined). SANE (Scientists Against Nuclear Energy) was paid in two successive years by NEH to produce 13 weekly radio shows "to examine the impact of nuclear weapons on American culture."

Council on Foreign Relations, \$500,000 (1980 and 1981). CFR, founded and dominated by David Rockefeller, received the half-million-dollar NEH grants for its International Affairs Fellowship Program.

Sierra Club, \$87,493 (1980). The Sierra Club, among environmental groups the most vocal in denouncing Interior chief James Watt, received its NEH grant to collect and transcribe 40 to 60 taped interviews of Sierra Club activists and other environmental leaders.

National Council on Aging, \$910,907 (1979). This grant was to allow the Council to continue "the development and use of humanities materials in senior centers. The Council also received \$135,000 in 1980 and \$48,000 in 1981 from NEA.

Working Women (National Association of Office Workers), \$216,953 (1979 and 1980). Working Women received this grant for a two-year project to "implement a curriculum on the history of working women, to be disseminated through national networks of women's studies programs."

Unions received big grants from NEH under Duffey. The following grants are from just 1980 and 1981: International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), \$175,000; Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, \$317,000; District 1199 (New York) of the Drug and Hospital Employees Union, \$300,000; and the AFL-CIO George Meany Center for Labor Studies, \$30,000.

Other projects include:

An erotic arts show (as advertised) this winter at the Washington, D.C. Women's Arts Center, cosponsored by NEA and a store called the Pleasure Chest, "which sells lingerie, leather items, vibrators and 'toys for adults,'" (Washington Post) \$9,000 in tax dollars was spent on this project.

A 1981 survey of how religion affects votes by congressmen. NEH-funded sociologists divided congressmen into the following "religious categories"—Nominal; Legalistic, emphasizing rigid rules and lifestyle; Self-concerned, seeing religion as a source of social comfort; People-concerned, having a marked concern for social justice; Integrated, balancing religious themes, and Nontraditional, believing in a more abstract God.

A radio series on prominent secular humanists of the 20th century, broadcast in 1981 on National Public Radio stations and funded by NEH. Among those honored in this series of "sound portraits": Bertolt Brecht, Noam Chomsky, Simone de Beauvoir, W.E.B. DuBois and Sigmund Freud. ●

KEVIN E. CARTIE, WYOMING WINNER IN VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the following "Voice of Democracy" essay, written by Kevin Cartie of Cheyenne, Wyo. Kevin's speech won top prize in Wyoming and I think it captures the sense of patriotism that makes this Nation so great. I would urge my colleagues to take a minute and read this thoughtful essay.

About four months ago my brother became a Private in the United States Army. I couldn't understand his reasoning. Why join now? If there ever is a war then he will be drafted then. Why jump the gun? Why not wait and join as needed?

So I approached him with these questions and he answered me simply and directly, "I am only trying to do my part to build America."

I thought and thought about his answer, trying to understand what he had meant. Finally it dawned on me. Each of us has a part in building America. It cannot be just a few. It must be all of us working together. No man is an island, we always need others. America is like a giant puzzle, and without each piece, whether that piece is a baker a lawyer, a garbage man, or a Private in the United States Army, without each piece, she is incomplete.

But wait, what did he mean "... to build America?" I thought America was already built up enough. We've built up the world's greatest form of government, we are the richest country in the world, and we've built up our military so that now we are one of the most powerful in the world. What more could we need to build?

So once again I approached my brother and once again he answered me simply and directly. "There are some things in our country that we must never stop building." Once again I thought and thought. What could these things be that we can't stop building? What is something that can never be finished?

Suddenly it came to me. Emotions, of course. Courage, pride, honor, love, ambition. Without each of these, America would not be the same. It was the courage, the courage of the revolutionaries that freed our country. It was the courage of Thomas Jefferson that helped write those unforgettable words known as the Declaration of Independence, it was the courage of our soldiers that ended the two World Wars.

And it was pride and honor that helped build our country up to the richest and one of the most technologically advanced countries. It was pride and honor that made us the most respected country in the world. It was love, a love of country, of ideals and a love of freedom that built this great land of ours. But it took more than that to build a stone, a foundation. It took ambition, ambition that helped bring all of our democratic ideas and beliefs into being over two hundred years ago.

All of these were needed then and they are needed now. They had challenges then that they met and overcame with the help of these emotions. Our country still must meet and overcome challenges. But in order to do this, we need these emotions to drive us on.

We must also continue to build our values. It was our beliefs and values that made us want a change in government. But in the last generation our values have decreased. We must continue to build our values to keep them as high as they are. Our values decide what our nation is like. If we wish to keep our nation the greatest in the world, we must also keep our values the greatest in the world.

I love my country and the freedoms I can enjoy in this country, and I feel obligated to help build America to keep it as great as it is. My forefathers worked together to establish what we today know as America, and we must continue to build so that future generations can enjoy the same rights as we do.

My brother is doing his part to continue to build America as a Private in the United

States Army, and I know that there is a role for me in building America, because as William Faulkner once said, "I believe man will not only endure, he will prevail." ●

"TOP CRACKERS" SELECTED

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a recent selection by readers of several Florida newspapers designated two residents of my district as the "Top Crackers" in Florida.

This unusual honor was bestowed upon Mr. J. T. Earl of Hatch Bend and Ms. Ora Smith of Hosford, two remarkably colorful characters who fit none of life's ordinary molds but who have won the love and respect of virtually all those who have come to know them.

Ms. Smith operates Ora's Oyster Bar in Hosford, a hospitable haven for both the humble and the powerful, not only of northwest Florida, but from all over the State. Each is treated with the same caustic respect once they pass through the door of Ora's.

Mr. Earl, like his forebears back to his great-grandfather, never felt the desire to leave his home on the banks of the Suwannee River, and the only extensive time he spent away from Hatch Bend was during 2 years of Army service during World War II.

I would like also to commend newspaper columnist Ray Washington for his efforts in polling readers to find, interview, and immortalize Florida's two "Top Crackers" who represent much of the color and diversity of the great Second District of Florida. ●

BOB HATCH PROVES JOB TRAINING WORKS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recent budget cuts, although well intentioned, sometimes cut deeper in the wrong areas. One such area, I believe, was in areas to provide funds for employment and on-the-job training programs.

I was heartened, therefore, to see a highly respected businessman from the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, not only echo those sentiments but prove such programs can be effective.

Just about a year ago, Mr. Robert (Bob) Hatch, Jr., of Bethel Park, the manager of Pettibone Corp.'s operations in Pittsburgh and the Northeastern part of our country, was ap-

pointed to the joint Allegheny County-City of Pittsburgh Private Industry Council (PIC-PAC). Bob, a former New York State representative, takes public service seriously, and during his year on PIC-PAC quickly convinced his business "neighbors" of the value of on-the-job training programs. Subsequently, he provided 25 opportunities for the economically disadvantaged residents of Allegheny County.

Bob's achievements in such a short span of time were recognized by the county's department of Federal programs and he was the subject of an article in an in-house information bulletin published last month.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting that article into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues and I would like, on behalf of the Congress of the United States, to extend our appreciation and congratulations to Bob Hatch. He is an outstanding individual who believes in serving people and practices what he preaches. The article follows:

KEEP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, LOCAL BUSINESSMAN URGES

Public service is very serious business to local businessman Bob Hatch. Not only does he manage Pettibone Corporation's operations in Pittsburgh and the Northeastern United States, but he is currently serving his third unpaid five-year term as Secretary of the Bethel Park Municipal Authority.

Appointed to the joint Allegheny County-City of Pittsburgh Private Industry Council (PIC-PAC) in April 1981, Hatch looked at the goals of the PIC-PAC "to see how I could best serve its purpose. I said to myself, 'dammit,' somebody better go out and tell employers about the (Title VII Private Sector Initiatives) program."

And that's exactly what Bob Hatch did. He talked with several of his business "neighbors" in the Bethel Park area and soon developed twenty-five on-the-job training opportunities for economically disadvantaged residents of Allegheny County.

Hatch's commitment to the public good dates back to his days as a Sergeant in the U.S. Army during World War II, from which he emerged the most highly decorated living veteran of the South and Central Pacific theaters. From 1963 to 1964 he represented the Syracuse area as New York State Assemblyman.

Of his role on the PIC-PAC, Hatch says, "If you belong to a committee, you should work at it. How can you justify being on a committee if you don't?"

He finds the cuts in employment and training programs "tragic", possibly resulting in "high crime rates and even higher unemployment rates for young blacks." He likens the effect of these cuts to conditions among the Appalachian poor in the 1960's, "when we had a generation of people who had no hope of improving their lot."

Despite funding cutbacks, Hatch feels that "we have to lay plans to move forward with a positive program. Fewer CETA dollars mean that we have to do more investigation and put more thought into the planning and development of (employment and training) programs to get the most mileage out of our dollars."

Overall, Hatch believes the CETA program is worthwhile and "abolishing it will

leave a void. The country needs employment and training programs." ●

YEN FOR AMERICAN BEEF

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal recently published a short editorial commenting on this Nation's trade problems with Japan and the commendable effort being made by the Reagan administration and the Congress to lift the unreasonable restrictions placed upon the importation of goods grown and manufactured in the United States. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 5860, to specifically address the trade barriers which the Japanese use to keep American agricultural products out of that country. While we must be concerned about the restrictions on manufactured products as well, I believe that increased trade in agricultural products particularly would benefit both the United States and Japan, and that relations between our two countries would be vastly improved if we could see a good faith effort to make significant progress in this important area. As the Congress begins to look seriously at enacting trade reciprocity legislation, I think the points made in this short piece are worth consideration, and I request that the article be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.), Journal, Mar. 5, 1982]

YEN FOR AMERICAN BEEF

More power to the Reagan administration as it tried to bring down Japan's trade barriers against the importation of grain-fed beef from the United States.

We have it to sell in large, decently-priced amounts. The Japanese population is keen to buy. If only the Japanese government would demonstrate some give on import restrictions.

Deputy U.S. Trade Representative David Macdonald told the Asian and Pacific subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that Japanese tourists here now carry back "packets of beef" from the U.S. being unable to purchase it domestically.

Shades of Americans lugging home bread from Paris, or sherry from Spain!

In 1981, our trade deficit with Japan climbed to a disgraceful \$16 billion.

That figure is at once an indictment of Japan's restrictive import policies and the quality and character of American-made products which lose out to Japanese competition.

Trade is a two-way street. We're pleased the Reagan administration is pounding home the point to Tokyo. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a speech written by the Utah State winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. The speech was written by Alice Ann Warner, a senior student at Provo High School in Provo, Utah. Miss Warner is an outstanding young lady with many admirable accomplishments to her credit. This winning speech qualifies her to compete at the national level for important college scholarships. I am proud to submit Miss Warner's speech in the RECORD, for the recognition and enjoyment of my colleagues.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM UTAH WINNER—ALICE A. WARNER

It's early morning in Boston, April 18, 1775. In Bradford Lane a 10-year old apprentice yawns his way to the workroom. He lays the fire hurriedly; for today, a kerosene lamp must be finished for Mr. Adams, and a gross of candles delivered to the Old North Church.

Across the harbor a stable boy is combing a horse. He does not know it, but he is preparing a mount for what will turn out to be America's most historic ride.

Downhill, near the docks, the harbormaster checks the oarlocks on a rowboat. This very night, it will carry across the water a silversmith named Paul Revere.

The cobbled streets vibrate with commerce. Not even the red-clad soldiers posted at every corner can impede the purpose and productivity that can be seen and heard everywhere.

Two hundred years later, Boston awakens to honking horns. On the dock, longshoremen load massive ships.

In the wholesale market, truckloads of produce are distributed throughout New England.

A different Boston now, than then? Some say yes—they say that in the earlier era, America was caught up in the common dream of working together to create this nation. This dream, the critics maintain, has been replaced by an emphasis on individual success. That, they say, is what's wrong with America! But this assessment is mistaken, and far too pessimistic. Our forebearers were united in building America together because each was driven by a desire to better his own life. So what he produced had to excel; it had to be good. And because it was good, it enriched other's lives as well as his own. Edison's light bulb is our light bulb. The stories of Mark Twain are a national treasure. Neil Armstrong stepped onto the moon for me.

None of that has changed. We have not lost the way we have always worked together. We have not ceased to build America the way we have always done.

Just as someone built America by making the candles that hung in the Old North Church, so now someone makes the lights that illuminate the corridors of Congress.

April 20, 1982

Just as someone made the boat that carried Paul Revere across the harbor, so now someone works in the plants making the weapons that defend us.

And just as someone grew the grain that fed Sam Adams and his revolutionary friends, so now, from farmer to processor to packager to grocer goes the food that sustains the mighty and the lowly among us.

What we have kept alive is a miracle. Anyday—everyday—everyone of us enriches all of us by striving to improve our own lives. We are building America together by doing our best and letting others share in our achievement. That fact is the essence of America. For in America, there is no other way to enhance one's self—only by producing or creating what enriches others. Here millions of people labor, all so different in talents and training that you wonder how they could ever be united in one common effort of building America together. And yet—it happens. Everyday. Unknown to each other they participate in each other's lives, giving in order to achieve their own private dreams.

It was to protect this miracle that Adams and Washington stirred in their souls.

It was for this that magnificent American boys spilt their blood at Chateau Thierry, in the Solomon Islands, and on the Yalu River.

It was for this that the veterans of our wars wept when they returned to our shores.

It was for this—the freedom to build America together—that the selfless sacrifice was made.

It was for this miracle alone—for America, the one place where the lowliest of men have a voice in democracy—the noblest cause in the history of mankind.

I am only one individual, but I can do as much as anyone can do to build America. If I am not alone in developing my abilities, if I am not alone in being grateful for other's contributions, if I am not alone in defending their right to improve themselves, if I am not alone in revering the sacrifices that have created and protected my country, then together we can build America, where the hopes of each of us are the glory of us all. ●

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT HARRISON AND HENRY FRAZIER

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1982, the Rowland Unified School District will honor two retiring elementary school principals who have faithfully served the field of education for many years. I would like to take this opportunity to make my colleagues aware of these two fine gentlemen.

Mr. Robert T. Harrison is presently the principal of Hollingworth Elementary School in West Covina, Calif. His exemplary service to education and to his community is matched only by his colleague, Mr. Henry F. Frazier. Mr. Frazier is currently the principal of Farjardo Elementary School in Rowland Heights, Calif.

Mr. Harrison has been an elementary school principal for 21 years. Prior to his work in administration, he was a classroom teacher for 4 years.

Mr. Frazier has devoted over 27 years of service to education. He was a classroom teacher for 4 years, an assistant elementary school principal for 1 year and has spent the past 22 years as an elementary school principal.

Public school education is the backbone of this country. The Rowland Heights Unified School District under the capable leadership of Dr. Stanley G. Oswald, superintendent, is fortunate to have Mr. Harrison and Mr. Frazier working in such responsible leadership positions.

I am sure I join with the many men and women and boys and girls who have been guided by the work of Mr. Frazier and Mr. Harrison. I ask my colleagues to join in this salute to these fine men whose remarkable careers have had such effect on so many. ●

DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE NAZI HOLOCAUST

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, this day, April 20, marks one of the most tragic and horrifying events in the history of the human race. Today has been designated by an act of Congress as the Day of Remembrance of Victims of the Nazi Holocaust, known as Yom HaShoa to those of the Jewish faith.

This day is dedicated to the memory of the 6 million Jews who were systematically murdered by the unspeakable Nazi regime of Germany before and during World War II. There are no words in any language that can convey adequately the horrifying degradation and brutal inhumanity of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi officialdom, the murderers who conceived and carried out this terrible crime.

But there is one word—Holocaust—which gives some suggestion of the terrifying wave of horror which engulfed an entire people innocent of any wrongdoing.

Mr. Speaker, it is our solemn duty and grave responsibility to make certain that the terrible story of the Holocaust is held fresh in the memory of every living person. It is our solemn duty and grave responsibility to guard against the tyranny and bigotry which propelled the perpetrators of this terrible outrage into their atrocious actions. It is our solemn duty and grave responsibility to make certain that the Holocaust, which consumed the lives of 6 million innocent men, women, and children, can never be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, on this Day of Remembrance of the Nazi Holocaust, let each one of us vow to carry in our hearts and minds for all of our lives two simple words: "Never Again!"

We must never again permit another Holocaust to sear human lives.

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES: PRESIDENT REAGAN SHOULD HAVE BEEN KILLED

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, this short item I am about to introduce for the benefit of my colleagues should be an incentive to halt Federal funding for all these special-interest groups, for which I have had so much to render for this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Once again, I would like to encourage my colleagues to share this item and others with their constituents back home and ask them if they approve such funding.

Recipient of at least \$143,776 of taxpayer money is radio station WPFW, right here in the Nation's Capital. This is the same radio station that, following the attempted assassination of President Reagan, lamented the fact that the President was not killed. Further, in another broadcast, an announcer recommended a larger caliber bullet, a "45," should have been used.

How much education and exposure does it take to halt this blatant abuse of taxpayers money? I certainly hope not much more. In any event, one more item from the Conservative Digest of April 1982, titled, "Tax-Funded Broadcasting Aids Radical Leftists," is presented for documentation and incentive for my colleagues to halt this practice. The article follows:

TAX-FUNDED BROADCASTING AIDS RADICAL LEFTISTS

The tax-funded Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), has a history of supporting hard-Left programming and radical radio stations with the money given it by Congress.

In September 1981, CPB spent \$148,000 to broadcast anti-Reagan propaganda from Solidarity Day, which was sponsored by several leftwing unions and, among others, the U.S. Communist party.

CPB also used money normally reserved for hard-news events (like space exploration) to broadcast "El Salvador: Another Vietnam?", a pro-Left documentary, on the nationwide Public Broadcast System. The airing was timed to coincide with the Soviet-backed guerrillas' "final offensive" (which was a failure).

The Pacifica Foundation operates five radio stations around the country. In the last five years, CPB gave at least \$1.6 million to Pacifica, whose leftist slant and broadcasting of offensive material has brought numerous complaints against them to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

The license of Pacifica's Washington, D.C. station, WPFW, has been challenged by the conservative Washington Legal Foundation. The case of WPFW may be seen as a microcosm for the entire tax-funded Pacifica system.

Consider these points while reading the following:

A station must present both sides of a controversial issue. (The "Fairness Doctrine") The mere voicing of these opinions is not at issue.

A station is responsible for everything that goes out from its transmitter. (This includes phone-in callers.)

The station cited, WPFW, has not been heard to present the opposing view on the following subjects.

WPFW AIRS EXTREMIST PROPAGANDA AGAINST U.S. AND EL SALVADOR

Speakers on WPFW repeatedly link the U.S. and the Duarte government with Hitler and his actions. "(These) bloody crimes . . . are the same as those of Hitler." (Sept. 21, 1980) "(This is) indiscriminate, genocidal oppression equal to that of the Nazis." (July 22, 1981) The speaker also asserted that the Reagan administration's involvement in El Salvador was "racist motivated." (same date)

U.S. IS A RACIST NATION, SAYS TAX-FUNDED STATION

On Aug. 10, 1981, a speaker on WPFW said that the neutron bomb is being developed so that it could be deployed against black people in the U.S. Another in the same program said that the word "terrorists" is really a code word for blacks, and equated anti-terrorist measures with racism. The next day, a speaker suggested that the King Tut exhibit (then being shown in Washington) was to perpetuate white supremacy by portraying the ancient Egyptians as white.

REAGAN SHOULD HAVE DIED, STATION BROADCASTS

On the day President Reagan was shot, WPFW broadcast the following on a phone-in talk show:

"I feel that the person that shot President Reagan should have killed him . . . I feel that Reagan is an unthoughtful person . . . And I'm sorry this man (John Hinckley, the accused assassin) is being incarcerated for something he tried to do. I wish he had succeeded . . ."

The morning after the Reagan shooting, an announcer on WPFW said Reagan's assassin "should have had a '45,'" according to the complaint.

WPFW is also accused of violating FCC standards by broadcasting obscene and offensive material on the airwaves. At least one other Pacifica station (WBAI in New York) has received similar complaints.

And you paid for it. In the past five years, WPFW received at least \$143,776 in tax dollars from CPB and the National Telecommunications and Information Agency. ●

PARISHIONERS TO HONOR
MSGR. BASIL SHEREGHY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 25, 1982, more than 200 parishioners of the Transfiguration of Our Lord Byzantine Catholic Church in McKeesport, Pa. will honor their spiritual leader, Msgr. Basil Shereghy, on the occasion of his 40th anniversary in the priesthood.

Many religious and civic leaders, led by the metropolitan archbishop of the Byzantine Church, Stephen J. Kocisko, will join in paying tribute to this man who has earned the admiration, respect, and love of all who know him.

There is an intriguing aspect of Monsignor Shereghy's career in the church which concerns his mastery of the English language. When he came to the United States in 1946, the monsignor did not speak a word of English. Today, however, he is recognized throughout the Nation as an outstanding lecturer and author.

Monsignor Shereghy achieved this distinction through a most unusual method. He learned English by reading and re-reading Webster's Dictionary, then tracing the words back to their roots in a language he was quite familiar with—Latin.

The monsignor's calling to the priesthood also is quite understandable when one looks at his family history. He comes from a long, long line of priests. As a matter of fact, his father, the Reverend Andrew Shereghy was a priest in Carpatho, Ruthenia, (now Czechoslovakia) where Monsignor Shereghy was born in 1918. Furthermore, service to the church in the monsignor's family dates back 250 years on his father's side and 300 years on the side of his mother, Isabelle Jackovics Shereghy.

Monsignor Shereghy was ordained on March 29, 1942, and taught in local parochial schools in Czechoslovakia, rising to the position of professor of domestic theology and rector of the diocesan seminary at Uzhorod before emigrating to the United States in 1946.

His first assignment in the United States was as a professor at St. Procopius Seminary in Lisle, Ill., where he served until transferred to the transfiguration Church in McKeesport in 1954. During his stay in McKeesport, Monsignor Shereghy also served as a professor of theology at the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Pittsburgh. In 1957 he left the area to assume the pastorate of St. John's Church in Minneapolis, Minn., but returned to McKeesport in 1965, and a decade later Pope Paul VI

bestowed upon him the title of monsignor.

Monsignor Shereghy's activities range far beyond the church. He loves to write and has published several books, pamphlets, and articles on Byzantine theology, history, and religion. In addition, he edited the Byzantine Catholic World, the official publication of the rite in Pittsburgh, for 2 years, 1973-75, and presently is the editor of The Enlightenment, the voice of the United Societies in the United States of America.

The monsignor also is an avid coin collector, belonging to several numismatic organizations and is the vice president of the Israeli Coin Club of Pittsburgh. Despite his involvement in these groups, he still finds the time to serve as director of the Archdiocesan Heritage Museum in Pittsburgh and on the board of the Catholic Golden Agers.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States I congratulate Monsignor Shereghy on this anniversary of his entry into the priesthood and join with his many friends in the hope he will continue to be an inspiration to all of us for years to come.●

NEW LIFE COMMUNITY CHURCH
CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New Life Community Church in Artesia, Calif. will be celebrating its 50th anniversary on May 2, 1982. I am proud to be able to recognize the fine work of the church before my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The church was organized in 1932 as the Artesia Reformed Church. Purely democratic in government, the New Life Community Church is typically Protestant in worship, yet broad enough to make room for everyone.

In its 50 years of existence, the congregation has been served by six pastors with a seventh man serving as interim pastor from time to time. Under the present leadership of the senior pastor, Dr. Kenneth N. Leestma, the church has continued to grow and prosper.

The communities of Artesia and Cerritos are very fortunate to have a place to worship that serves the spiritual needs of the families and provides programs that aid every age group. New Life Community Church has an unlimited future, and I am pleased to join with my fellow Members in wishing warmest congratulations for 50 more years of outstanding service.●

POTHOLES AND THE GAS TAX

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, much of our Nation's highways, bridges, mass transit systems, and other public facilities are in need of repair, restoration, resurfacing, or reconstruction. They are wearing out faster than we are fixing or replacing them. To raise the funds to do this, the Secretary of Transportation has proposed increasing the gasoline tax by 4 cents per gallon.

Some of my colleagues have argued that it would be sheer hypocrisy for the Congress to raise any taxes less than a year after it approved a large cut. Whether you call them revenue enhancers or user fees, they say, taxes are taxes, and we should be holding the line.

A column by George F. Will appeared recently in the Washington Post which I feel makes a strong case for the need for increasing the gasoline tax. As Mr. Will points out, the decline in America's transportation infrastructure is widespread, affecting big cities and rural areas alike. Much of that decline would not have occurred had we not neglected its warning signs years ago. Yesterday's unfilled pothole is today's road in need of complete resurfacing.

A 4-cent-per-gallon increase in the gasoline tax would be a minor burden on consumers, especially in light of the recent rapid decrease in prices at the pump, and the \$4 billion it would raise would go a long way toward revitalizing the Nation's transportation infrastructure. Mr. Will's column, which I submit here for my colleagues' consideration, should dispel any doubts about the need for the gasoline tax increase:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1982]

WHAT POTHOLES SAY ABOUT US

(By George F. Will)

In 1980, Republicans rebelled against the iniquity of the 55 mph national speed limit and denounced it in their platform. Democrats laughed. Republicans swept the West, where folks don't take kindly to the feds slowing down a fella's pickup.

But today there are stretches of the Interstate Highway System where traffic creeps at 30 mph because of potholes and crumbling pavement. What is the Republican administration going to do about these and similar problems?

If Drew Lewis, the secretary of transportation has his way, taxes will be raised. I mean, revenues will be enhanced. That is, costs will be recovered by, er, augmenting "user fees." Principally, Lewis wants a 4-cent increase in the federal tax on a gallon of gasoline.

Only the gallantry I learned at my father's knee keeps me from hooting when

Republicans devise euphemisms to avoid saying "tax increases." But Lewis has a point about the gas tax being a user fee. He proposes raising \$4 billion annually from the four-cent increase, and another \$1 billion from other user fees, primarily on heavy trucks. About \$1 billion would be dedicated to mass transit capital investments.

This last provision, although perhaps justifiable, muddies Lewis' argument. The lofty morality of user fees—what makes them noble, whereas tax increases are yucky—is that users of a service should pay for it. But, if so, mass-transit users should pay for mass transit with their fares. Lewis is nothing if not nimble, and he argues that highway users should pay with "user fees" some of the costs of the mass transit they do not use, because highway users will benefit from more adequate highway capacity when more folks are using mass transit.

Oh, well. Lewis is not only secretary of sophistry, he is also secretary of transportation. And the transportation system has problems that are more serious than Lewis' casuistry about user fees.

It has been well said that maintenance, as much as original construction, is a measure of a society's vitality. It also is a measure of maturity, of the willingness to make timely provision for the future. By this measure, America is increasingly deficient.

The Interstate Highway System is not yet completed, but 10 percent needs resurfacing immediately and almost half will need major repairs by 1995. Even a three-year deferral of repairs can triple the cost—not even counting inflation. In the next 15 years, 216,000 miles of other roads in rural areas will need at least resurfacing. (An Arizona county recently tore up 250 miles of paved roads and put down gravel because that was cheaper than repairing the potholes.)

The design life of a bridge is 50 years. Seventy-five percent of America's bridges are more than 45 years old. Forty percent are judged deficient. It would take \$60 billion just to eliminate the backlog of needed bridge repairs.

It would take \$6 billion just to replace transit buses that are more than 15 years old. New York City would need \$110 billion over the next decade just to rehabilitate its transit system. It also must resurface much of its 6,000 miles of streets (and must repair most of its 2,400 miles of water system and 6,100 miles of sewer system).

Gasoline cost 31 cents a gallon in 1959, when the tax was last raised (to 4 cents). The price of gasoline has quadrupled, highway construction costs have risen 300 percent, and the four cents are worth less than one cent. A gas tax proportional to four cents on a 31-cent gallon would today be 16 cents on a \$1.24 gallon, double what Lewis wants it to be.

Conservatives rightly describe indexing of tax brackets as a cure for "surreptitious, unlegislated" tax increases. They should, therefore, describe what has happened to the gasoline tax since 1959 as a "surreptitious, unlegislated" tax cut.

There are today many varieties of liberalism and conservatism, with interesting similarities and incongruities, rather like the Synoptic Gospels. Keeping track of them requires an intellectual micrometer. But unless I have missed something, there is not yet an ideological difference between conservatives and liberals regarding potholes. Whites and blacks, Jews and gentiles, WASPs and ethnics—we are all against bridges falling down.

But many conservatives have not come to terms with this fact: private life—including private enterprise—depends on a publicly provided physical infrastructure. It is not optional; neither is it inexpensive. It illustrates this fact: a substantial portion—perhaps 80 percent—of public spending is not really a subject of serious disagreement.●

CELEBRATION OF SOLIDARITY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an affair, which will take place this Sunday, April 25, in the district I represent. Several hundred residents of Long Island and the surrounding area will gather to participate in the third annual Celebration of Solidarity breakfast in Franklin Square, N.Y. The Commission for Social Justice of the Order of Sons of Italy in America and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith of the Long Island region are the sponsors of this event, which signifies the unity of Italian Americans and Jewish Americans in combating discrimination.

In a nation founded on the principles of freedom, justice, and equality of opportunity, we must all actively strive to insure that those qualities are enjoyed by all groups. In recent years, Government has made great strides through the legislative and judicial processes toward the establishment of a society where prejudice is eliminated. However, much remains to be done.

Organizations such as the Social Justice Commission and the Anti-Defamation League have reached a point beyond the grasp of Government. Laws and regulations cannot always erase the stereotypes and the subtle forms of discrimination in society. Action must be taken by individuals and groups within our communities to dispel myths and prejudices perpetuated by the narrow minded among us.

I am proud of the efforts of many of my constituents whose untiring efforts have contributed to attainment of the goals our Founding Fathers enunciated in our Constitution and bill of rights. We are all familiar with great leaders in our history who have led struggles for freedom and equality. I am confident that future generations will look back upon the work of the Anti-Defamation League and the Commission for Social Justice with similar respect, and I congratulate the members of those organizations for continuing to heal the scars of discrimination in our society.●

WORDS OF WISDOM: "LET'S REVIVE THE MILITIA"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in this the era of the scare tactic being promoted by various sundry individuals and organizations, especially in the nuclear arms field, it would be well to examine a resource which Americans of recent generations have paid little or no heed. That resource is domestic defense that can be realized by resurrecting the militia.

In Federalist 24, Alexander Hamilton spoke of our "standing force," or standing army that was needed in the early years of America as an organized force to defend the Western Frontier. He spoke of that organized force as the organized militia, but the people at large constitute the unorganized militia. And Hamilton stressed that the unorganized militia, that is, we the people, as the unorganized militia shall serve to keep in check any possible intent of a standing army to be used to suppress the rights of the citizenry. The fear of central government with too much power, as well as "standing" or mercenary armies which destroyed the Roman Republic, was paramount in the thinking of those Founding Fathers who fought for the Constitution.

Subsequent to those early days of the Federalist papers, it was Congressman Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts that made one of the most important points on the matter of the reasons for sustaining the right to keep and bear arms. As if echoing Alexander Hamilton, Gerry stated in essence that the keeping of arms by people in their homes and places of business would guarantee that no Federal Government would dare any oppression against the citizenry.

With these points in mind, I would like to share with my colleagues a very definitive piece from the March 1982 Conservative Digest on the subject, "Let's Revive the Militia." Written by Morgan Norval, editor of Political Gun News, it discusses that frontier of defense that has been sadly neglected by civil and military defense strategists.

The Soviets have been conducting two-pronged strategy for many years. One is an attempt at nuclear superiority for itself and its enslaved satellites combined with a nuclear disarmament propaganda offensive to their opponents. The other strategy is one of a constant proxy insurgent warfare by any means possible in critical areas around the world. This latter strategy is perhaps the most important reason

why my colleagues would absorb Morgan Norval's article.

The Soviets in Afghanistan today are realizing what even a partially armed citizenry can and has done to the mighty Communist invasion force. One can imagine what would happen in Switzerland and the United States, as Mr. Norval points out, should they decide to conquer either.

We have—although the full potential has not been realized—the highest counter-insurgency trained individuals in the world in the Green Berets or Special Forces as they are otherwise known. It is known that the esprit de corps of those Green Berets requires them to carry on their person the orders of Rogers Rangers going back to counter-insurgency operations in the French and Indian War. It is high time that this Nation once again became thus prepared. To realizing this full potential of American gun owners, Mr. Norval's informative article follows:

LET'S REVIVE THE MILITIA
(By Morgan Norval)

When President Reagan on Oct. 2, 1981, announced the United States would build the MX missile system and end "our long neglect" of strategic and civil defense, civil defense supporters got a much-needed shot in the arm. Adding to this promise, he said, "... as part of this effort I have also directed that we devote greater resources to improving our civil defense."

It's about time!

Our civil defense efforts have been a national disgrace due largely to a misguided strategic thesis that renders civil defense as a useless, concept.

That strategic concept, Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD), assumes both the United States and Russia would obliterate each other in a nuclear exchange.

The Soviets don't buy the MAD concept. Their strategic thinking is based on a different concept—a nuclear war is not only possible but winnable! Their massive rearmament and huge civil defense program show how seriously they are carrying out this strategic thinking.

The Soviet views are in stark contrast to the "no winner" view underpinning our MAD strategic concept that has left us with an almost non-existent survival—civil defense—program.

But, we do have a survival program for high federal officials. They have superb underground homes, bunkers and offices located throughout the country! In fact, over 4,000 nuclear war shelters exist for officialdom and for the military. But no such thing exists for the vast bulk of the people. Although civil defense, or survivability, is a high priority item for government officials, it is low priority for the taxpaying citizen. As a result our population is virtually helpless against the ravages of a nuclear war.

The potential consequences of this nuclear war unpreparedness are gruesome: The U.S. would lose up to one-half of its population! The ensuing chaos would be of such a magnitude that the survival of our society would be in question.

Gen. David C. Jones, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that a Soviet nuclear attack on North America could kill "hundreds of millions" in what would be

"the greatest catastrophe in history by many orders of magnitude."

Our military installations—prime targets—would be wiped out by a Russian nuclear attack. According to "Soviet Strategy For Nuclear War" published by the Hoover Institution of Stanford University, the Russians would also target heavy industry with any military potential whatsoever (especially transport, bridges, chemical and communications facilities, railroads and electrical power complexes). It seems the Russians are well aware of our total dependence on electrical power.

Such an attack would leave us prostrate and an easy prey for a Soviet invasion. This would be inevitable, as it is the only way to make sure the Soviets have destroyed the U.S. militarily.

A viable civil defense effort in the United States would save many millions of lives—up to 95 percent of the population, according to some experts. Experts realize this and have made many and varied recommendations to boost our civil defense capabilities. Yet, without exception, these experts have ignored a vast American resource—the American gun owner. Numbering 55 to 60 million, this vast pool of armed citizenry has been ignored by our civil defense planners.

This omission should be rectified immediately! It is time to revive an institution of armed citizenry—an institution that goes back to the Colonial period—the militia.

Our defense planners should take note, and organize American gun owners into local militia. These units could be organized on a state-wide basis with the state governors empowered to grant militia commissions and call it out in emergencies—from evacuation of civilians during floods, hurricanes and other natural disasters to the reinforcement of local police during civil disturbances.

Such a militia would tap the vast experience of our retired military personnel, forming the nucleus of the local militia.

Individual members of the militia would be required to furnish their own arms and equipment. To insure a nationwide standardization, militiamen and their female counterparts would be allowed and even encouraged to purchase surplus small arms and equipment through the office of the director of civilian marksmanship. In addition the militia also would be required to have, as part of their equipment, food rations for at least 30 days.

By requiring members to furnish their own equipment and rations, the cost of the program would be reduced. It would attract members who are highly motivated. If one is prepared to spend from \$500 to \$1,000 to equip oneself for participation in a national survival program, one is highly motivated.

The militia could be trained either by retired, state-commissioned military personnel or by regular U.S. military personnel. Since regular military personnel are already assigned to ROTC, National Guard and Reserve Forces, there should be little problem to assigning these units to state militia. Training would be geared to security proficiency, civil defense, disaster evacuations, and small-unit guerrilla tactics in case of foreign invasion.

The militia would be thoroughly trained in the use, care and safe handling of their small arms, with misuse subjecting members to swift and severe punishment.

Well-trained armed units profusely scattered throughout the country could also serve to restore order in areas suffering nuclear attack. Their training would enable

survivors emerging from the chaos of a nuclear holocaust to rally, reorganize and function in a manner that would hasten the reestablishment of society. Trained militia would be prepared to conduct guerrilla warfare against any invader.

If American gun owners were armed with surplus military small arms and had small-unit militia training like the Swiss have, invaders would confront a trained and well-armed citizenry—even after the high casualties inflicted by nuclear attack. Although such a threat might not deter a would-be aggressor, potential aggressors would have to take the existence of an "armed militia" into consideration when planning strategy and thus add this element of risk to invasion plans.

After their experiences in Afghanistan, the Russian Communists might think twice before launching a nuclear attack on the United States, particularly if they knew that surviving their nuclear attack would be several million armed, angry, trained guerrillas waiting for them.

Anti-gunners will, no doubt, denounce this proposal. Their arguments probably go along these lines: the people will misuse their arms, using guns to commit crimes, etc. Their arguments are old hat, going back to Plato's time, over 2000 years ago. They typify an attitude that runs rampant in current liberal anti-gun circles, an elite few who know what is best for the people—people should not be in a position to resist the elitist's decisions.

Yet these same anti-gun elitists don't mind when the people are conscripted and forced to bear arms. It would seem, according to their logic, the people are capable of bearing arms only when forced to do so. This is ridiculous reasoning, to say the least.

Gun ownership and individual citizens supplying their own arms as they come to the common defense in times of peril have deep roots in our country's history. In fact, this militia concept can be traced back to the Greek philosopher Aristotle who felt that bearing arms was a requisite of true citizenship. One cannot, he pointed out, be a citizen without participation in the body politic; one method of participation is bearing arms.

Dr. Joyce L. Malcom, a professor at Radcliffe College and a current fellow at Harvard Law School, points out: "The American tradition of an armed citizenry did not originate with the need for pioneers to protect themselves from Indians or wild animals, let alone from the 'Wild West, every-man-for-himself myth'." Instead, bearing arms was an essential element of our common law tradition that the early settlers brought with them from England.

The common law was quite specific about the peace-keeping—or the defense, as we say today—duties of the average citizen. Every man was expected to protect himself and his family and to defend his community and country as well. For these duties he was expected to have his own weapons and be proficient in their use. In addition, every able-bodied man was liable for militia duty. Standing armies were considered by our forefathers as the tools of tyrants; militias were the hallmark of free men.

This point was made recently by Ernest Moeregli of the Swiss Military Department. He said, "It's an old Swiss tradition that only an armed man can have political rights."

If we are to protect our political rights in a world becoming increasingly barbaric, each of us must rededicate ourself to the

goal of protecting our political rights from those bent on destroying them. One way is to give citizens the chance to serve in local militia units in each state.●

UNITED STATES-FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY RELATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some remarks that Arthur F. Burns, U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, made on United States-West German relations on April 5 before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

It is clear that although a majority of Germans remain supportive of the United States, there are problems today in our relations with the Federal Republic which we need to address.

Ambassador Burns' excellent statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR F. BURNS

My message today is simple: while there are problems in our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, the majority of Germans remains supportive of the United States and cognizant of the broad range of values and objectives we have in common.

Let me turn to some of our problems. Complaints on both sides of the Atlantic attest to an accumulation of tensions. Americans were disappointed in the Federal Republic's delay in deciding to boycott the Moscow Olympics after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. They frequently ask why Bonn seems reluctant to pay more to improve billets of American troops in Germany. They were disturbed by the initial reluctance of the Federal Republic's leaders to recognize publicly the Soviet role in the military takeover in Poland. They are puzzled by German criticisms of American policy with regard to El Salvador and Nicaragua. On their side, again to give some examples, Germans have complained in recent years about "zig-zags" in American foreign policy and indicated that they wanted stronger U.S. leadership. Now many Germans worry about what they regard as bellicosity in Washington and over-emphasis on military solutions.

Although economic problems have played a part in the friction between our two countries, it is largely the result of political and psychological forces.

There is increasing anxiety among the German public, particularly among young people, about the world in which they live. The sources of this anxiety are legion. Many Germans feel that their country has become a pawn in the struggle for supremacy between two superpowers—the Soviet Union and the United States. Fears of a nuclear war fought on German soil are widespread. Environmental concerns, especially with regard to reliance on nuclear fuel, are pronounced. There is now some fear of a harsher economic environment and a sagging social safety net. There is also a feeling

of alienation among young people, as well as among intellectuals at all ages, stemming from concerns about the role of technology and large impersonal organizations in their society. Many young people, furthermore, have come to believe that it is morally wrong to live in affluence when millions in the Third World are starving. Speaking more generally, many Germans nowadays feel that a coherent purpose in life has been eluding them.

Since the United States is frequently identified with things that trouble many Germans—notably, superpower rivalry, rampant technology, and militarism—concern has arisen in the Federal Republic about America's international role, more particularly about our ability to manage East-West relations wisely. The Soviet Union has found it useful to exploit European fears of armaments. It has done this with skill and energy, especially in West Germany. Soviet propaganda pictures the United States as a restless, bellicose power lacking a true desire for peace and willing to risk the nuclear destruction of Europe. At the same time the Soviet Union presents itself as working tirelessly in behalf of international peace and order. The massive peace offensive mounted by the Soviets seeks to drive a wedge between us and our European allies—an exercise in which they have been to some degree successful. I must say, however, that media concentration on "anti-Americanism" in West Germany strikes me as overdrawn and wide of the mark. The basic national interests of the United States and the Federal Republic have for many years been very similar and they are so recognized by a majority of the German people. In Germany we have a staunch ally. Nevertheless, German anxieties and the differences in perceptions that exist between us and the Federal Republic require careful attention on both sides of the Atlantic if we are to promote successfully our common interests.

Before addressing these issues, I wish to emphasize the need to get our economic houses in order. The element of friction between the United States and the Federal Republic is being worsened by economic difficulties in our two countries. Financial stringency largely accounts for Germany's disinclination to increase defense outlays at this time. Nevertheless, it even now appears that there will be some progress in German willingness to provide additional finance for NATO infrastructure. Partly because of our own economic problems, we want Germany to bear a larger burden in supporting American forces in the Federal Republic and in providing aid to common allies like Turkey. But Germany right now is preoccupied with difficulties of its own—high interest rates, rising unemployment, and budget constraints—which, though less intense than our economic troubles, are quite disturbing to German people. The Bonn government believes with some justification that Germany has made a steady, substantial contribution to NATO defenses during the past decade when the U.S. was downgrading its defense priorities. Bonn feels it must now tighten its belt. We should encourage that effort and try to understand that a healthier German economy will enable the Federal Republic to bear in the future the larger defense burden which we regard as its rightful share.

Politically, we must try harder to understand the interests that motivate the Federal Republic. In our admiration for Germany's postwar recovery, its economic strength and its increasing role in Europe, we some-

times fail to perceive the limitations that the Germans feel keenly—their status as a divided nation with millions of families having relatives or close friends in East Germany; their role as a European country with limited world responsibilities; their dependence on the good sense of the U.S. as a nuclear-protecting power, but one whose dependability has been called into question by Vietnam, Watergate, and occasional contradictory statements of policy emanating from Washington. Moreover, the Germans are troubled by their geographic proximity to the Soviet Union and the hazards attaching to the lonely outpost of Berlin.

Because of factors such as these the Federal Republic takes a different view toward détente than we do. To us détente was another approach to the old question of dealing with the Soviets—an approach that in the end has benefited us little. The Germans, on the other hand, feel that détente has resulted in reduced tensions in Europe and in a stabilized political situation in and around Berlin. In addition, the Germans have gained through détente closer contacts with their compatriots in the East, also improved trade relations, and a better lot for the 17 million Germans who reside in the German Democratic Republic.

To be sure, as we all know, détente did not lead the Soviets to abandon their foreign adventurism or their military buildup. Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and the military takeover in Poland have inevitably called into question the basis of détente and the future of Ostpolitik. Fortunately, the Reagan Administration has taken major steps to correct our response to Soviet actions. In general, the government of the Federal Republic approves our decision in this respect. It believes in firmness toward the Soviets. But it also believes that firmness must be coupled with continued dialogue to reduce tensions and to prevent jeopardizing the gains of Ostpolitik. It further believes, perhaps naively, that through a process of friendly communication we in the West can over time encourage respect by the Soviets for human rights as well as some restraint in their international behavior.

There are important differences in the geo-political roles of the United States and the Federal Republic that influence the world outlook of each. Germany is essentially a regional power. The United States, on the other hand, has global interests and responsibilities. We need to make hard decisions on numerous questions in which the direct interests of the Federal Republic are quite limited. Many Germans and Americans seem not to appreciate that difference. At times this failure leads to German resentment of our attitude toward their country and to a feeling that we ignore German interests. On the other hand, not a few Americans expect generous economic contributions for our sponsored projects in Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and other places, from a country that is not yet persuaded that it has a global responsibility.

It would be wise for the Germans to consider more carefully the complexities that the United States often faces in providing leadership for the Alliance and in taking actions in other areas of the world. From an American viewpoint the German Government has not been helpful on some issues where American interests are directly and heavily involved, as in the case of El Salvador. The American government feels that Germany needs to do more, together with other Allies, to show displeasure over the re-

pression engineered by the Soviets in Poland. We have also been troubled about the Federal Republic's caution in involving itself in some problems outside NATO's boundaries, particularly in the Persian Gulf area. We feel that the Federal Republic, being heavily dependent on imports of Middle Eastern crude oil, should play a larger role in support of American policies in that area. Our government is also inclined to believe that the German leadership should assume a larger burden of political responsibility in explaining agreed Alliance policies to its own public.

The United States and the Federal Republic can only achieve a better mutual understanding at the policy level through extensive and effective consultations. The approach to the arms control negotiations at Geneva exemplifies the value of good consultations with our NATO Allies. From our frequent conversations with the Germans during the preparatory period we gained important insights that helped us plan for our discussions with the Soviets. I think it is important for the German public, and not only those involved in the peace movement, to recognize that their government has had and is having a real voice in the formulation of Alliance policy on armaments control. Just as we have been doing in the armaments negotiations, so our two governments must strive for improved dialogue on other policy issues. To be a shade more specific, we should alert each other to emerging problems at an early stage and thus reduce the kind of misunderstanding that develops when one side thinks it is consulting and the other feels it is only being informed after the decisions have been taken. We certainly need to avoid situations where our efforts at genuine consultation are mistaken by the Germans as still another test of their loyalty.

Obviously, the Administration must take a leading role in shaping our relations with the Federal Republic, but there is also much that the Congress could do. This is especially true in the area of improving understanding of basic policy perceptions and interests of our two countries. One way to do this is in the context of the newly-created German-American group in the Bundestag. I urge your support of their effort. Get to know your German counterparts. Telephone them if necessary to get their views on issues under consideration here and convey to them your views about subjects of interest to the United States that are being discussed in Germany. I am assured by German parliamentarians that they are most eager to work closely with members of our Congress.

One issue currently under discussion with the German Government is the Administration's effort to restrain the flow of public credit to the Soviet Union. We are concerned that by extending credits on a liberal scale, European and some other governments have been strengthening the economic potential of the Soviet Union, and that they have thereby been helping indirectly to build up in some degree its military machine. The private market now recognizes the financial difficulties faced by the Soviet bloc and is, as a result, sharply curtailing its lending. The present American initiative is designed to parallel this reduction in private credits by seeking restraints on officially subsidized credits and export credit guarantees. The reduction of credits and credit guarantees will either cause a contraction in Soviet imports from the West or will require payment in hard currency for what the Soviets choose to purchase.

Our effort to restrict credit to the Soviet Union is perceived by some in Germany and elsewhere as "waging economic warfare." That is by no means the Administration's intention. We merely seek, as far as the Soviets are concerned, to have international financial markets work without undue interference by governmental financial agencies. Of course, our objective is to reduce the provision of advantageous financing to the Soviets so as not to undermine our efforts to strengthen the common defense. I urge you to understand this Administration effort and to help explain it to your German colleagues.

We must also try to stem the growing deficiency in understanding between our two countries that is reflected in a drifting away of young people from what had previously been a shared belief in our common moral and cultural heritage. Parents, teachers, journalists, and parliamentarians on both sides of the Atlantic have neglected their responsibilities in preparing the new generation of Americans and Europeans to take over the reins of power. The leaders in this rising "successor" generation in our two countries are often uninformed or, worse still, ill-informed about their respective peers. I sense, for example, in young Germans a lack of interest in the study of history—hence their lack of understanding of how the world got where it is. And I find in young Americans a lack of interest in the study of foreign languages and cultures. One of the more important objectives of the public policies of our two countries must therefore be an extension and deepening of the intellectual contact between the young people of our respective societies, so as to rekindle appreciation of each other's values and historic experiences and thus achieve a better understanding of our spiritual, economic, and political interdependence.

We already have a substantial and successful academic exchange program—the Fulbright Program—which brings German teachers and university students to the United States and sends American counterparts to the Federal Republic. I am convinced that this program is a vital element in our long-term bilateral relationship. I suggest that we now devote additional attention to an exchange program involving young people at a formative age—that is, well before their prejudices have become ingrained. I am always loath to suggest additions to the federal budget and am again reluctant to do so here. But I am certain that a show of Congressional intent and support, perhaps a redirection of some of the funds already available for our overseas information and cultural programs and a concerted appeal to the private sector for support of this program will be a worthwhile investment for our country. Experience has shown that long-term exchanges of young people, such as those conducted by the American Field Service and Youth for Understanding, pay lifetime dividends in understanding and appreciation of the culture and moral values of the country and the people visited. I therefore urge you to give suitable support to German-American youth exchanges.

I am convinced this will prove to be a good investment, not only because the Federal Republic is a key country in Europe but also because it is a loyal, dependable ally whose basic interests and values are essentially supportive of our own. This fact was borne home once again in a poll released recently in which West Germans expressed high confidence in and appreciation for the United

States. I believe that with greater sensitivity on our part and better understanding in Germany, our two countries can continue to work effectively together in furtherance of the moral, economic, and cultural values that constitute the essence of Western civilization. ●

OREGON'S WINNER IN THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding young man from my district who was recently awarded the voice of democracy scholarship sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign War and its ladies auxiliary. Scott Randal Cooper, of Prineville, Crook County, Oreg., delivered the winning speech in the Oregon voice of democracy contest.

I would like to insert Scott's speech, "Building America Together," into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BUILDING AMERICA TOGETHER

(By Scott R. Cooper)

To build a house requires only proper tools and a familiarity with one's work. It would seem that with enough time and proper training, it is a skill which might be acquired by almost anyone. But to build a nation—here is a challenge.

It was to this purpose that a small band of men, risking their very lives and fortunes, dedicated themselves just over two centuries ago. They were just ordinary citizens, but they had a cause. The result of their work was a new nation based on concepts never before utilized in governments of that time or times prior.

Today, we, the posterity of the patriots of two hundred years ago, benefit from the legacy left to us by our forefathers. We enjoy privileges and freedoms beyond the imagination of many who live in other countries of the world today. Yet a question remains unanswered: What are we to do that we too may leave a nation that is better than the one we found?

In my mind, of the many challenges that now face America, three stand out prominently: the battle against poverty, the fight against inequality, and the search for lasting peace.

There is little question that poverty is an enemy of mankind. The Declaration of Independence recognized the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" while leaders and documents such as John F. Kennedy and the Atlantic Charter proclaim that "Man has in his hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty" and that, "All men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Inequality, a foe of mankind since earliest history, has come under attack many times. The Mayflower Compact promised "equal and just" laws and later the Declaration of Independence established the principle that "All men are created equal." Every school child knows the Pledge of Allegiance and

daily vows to uphold the ideal of "liberty and justice for all." And equality must be sought for not only all races and nationalities but also for both sexes and for the unborn. None should be denied in a country as great as America.

The search for world peace, I believe, dates back to the first time a caveman threw a stone with intent to harm another. Someone must have protested for acts of overt aggression are unnatural to mankind in that they disrupt the general pattern of life. Abraham Lincoln spoke well at Gettysburg when he pledged the nation "to do all we may to achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations."

The solution to these problems facing the United States is summed up in the letters SAE: speak, act and educate.

We Americans must exercise our privileges granted under the First Amendment of our Constitution. We must speak out and let it be known that we will no longer tolerate injustice. We must issue a clear mandate to our leaders that we expect action from them in all these mentioned areas. But we must not place the burden of responsibility solely on the shoulders of a few. We must all go out and build together for tomorrow in any way we can. We must serve on committees, perform charitable works and do anything else that furthers the cause of justice and peace. Above all, we must make our opinions known through the polls and the media. We must also educate. We must teach society again the basic ideals that the country was founded on. It must be shown that freedom and liberty are never totally effective until they are available to all.

Those of us who live in the United States—land of the free, sweet land of liberty, America the Beautiful—must ensure that our rights continue after our passing. We must build for tomorrow in order that we may render today worthwhile.●

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE TO HOLD HEARINGS ON HABEAS CORPUS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, which I chair, is continuing hearings on revision of the Federal criminal laws. This week we are focusing on the habeas corpus provisions of H.R. 5679. The hearing will be held on Thursday, April 22, 1982, at 10 a.m. in room B-352 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The following witnesses are scheduled to testify: Prof. Stephen Gillers, New York University School of Law, on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union; Phyllis Skloot Bamberger, attorney-in-charge, Appeals Division, Federal Defender Services Unit of the Legal Aid Society of New York and chair of an American Bar Association Subcommittee of the Criminal Justice Section concerned with habeas corpus matters; Prof. Larry W. Yackle of the University of Alabama School of Law and author of a treatise on postconviction remedies;

and Richard J. Wilson, director of the Defender Division of the National Legal Aid Defender's Association.●

BUFFALO, N.Y., MARKS SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of New York's 37th Congressional District, it is a privilege for me to inform my colleagues that the city of Buffalo today—April 20, 1982—marks its 150th birthday anniversary.

As I reviewed my home town's history leading to this Sesquicentennial observance, I was impressed by a remark in a recent book: "Buffalo: Lake City in Niagara Land" by Richard C. Brown and Bob Watson. Discussing a difficult economic period in Buffalo during the early 19th century, it noted:

The rambunctious city was briefly down, but it was never out.

That comment captures the traditional hardiness, tenacity, and resiliency of Buffalo and its citizens. Whether it was the burning of Buffalo—then a frontier village—during the War of 1812, a debilitating cholera epidemic later that century or the more recent blizzard of 1977, this "City of Good Neighbors" has demonstrated the ability to weather adversity and bounce buoyantly into better days.

This historic upbeat attitude serves us well in Buffalo in modern times as well. As we suffer the ill effects of the recession, we look ahead with hope toward a period of community revitalization, a hope buttressed by ongoing construction of a light rail rapid transit system, which has sparked a series of public and private sector developments downtown and along the waterfront, which spawned the city's growth.

Buffalo's first boom came with the opening of the western end of the Erie Canal in the city on October 26, 1825. It was the beginning of the metamorphosis of a frontier village into a city.

The barges and packetboats that plied the canal brought the Nation a strong new transportation link that not only brought goods West but waves of immigrants eager to test the new frontiers. Thus, Buffalo was an inland port of immigrants, playing a key role in populating and cultivating the fertile lands in the Midwest and beyond.

As years passed, the canal then served to return grain from West to East, leading to Buffalo's development as a major port and grain-milling giant.

That process was sustained with the advent of the transcontinental rail-

road system that developed Buffalo as a key transportation hub.

Buffalo's potential attracted men of the caliber of Millard Fillmore and Grover Cleveland, two attorneys who became Presidents of the United States. Fillmore was the 13th President. Cleveland, who had served as Buffalo's mayor and Governor of New York, was our 22d and 24th President.

It was an exciting city that attracted the talents of men like the noted 19th century landscape architect Frederick Law Olmstead, who designed Buffalo's still-acclaimed public parks system. Recently several of Olmstead's creations in Buffalo were added to the National Register of Historic Places.

The city also continues to treasure several buildings and homes that were the handiwork of a then still relatively unknown Frank Lloyd Wright.

It was a growing community that attracted the interest of entrepreneurs like William G. Fargo, the founder of Wells, Fargo & Co. and the American Express Co., and who served as Buffalo's mayor during the Civil War.

Buffalo's development into a major transportation hub and industrial community also attracted wave after wave of hard-working immigrants, seeking jobs, freedom, and an opportunity to contribute to the development of this great Nation.

This tapestry of ethnic diversity continues today in Buffalo, where a community of persons of Irish, German, Polish, Italian, Black, Jewish, Ukrainian, Greek, Hispanic, Hungarian, and other backgrounds blend into this "City of Good Neighbors."

Buffalo has acquired many attractive assets in its 15 decades, including a public and private education network that offers abundant and diverse learning experiences.

Buffalo is the home of the noted Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, the Buffalo Bills, and the Buffalo Sabres.

This Sesquicentennial event has provided me an opportunity to look back with pride at the development of our great city and the contributions its citizens have made in a century and a half to the greatness of our country.

This look at the past also has provided me with a strong sense of optimism for the city's future.

The basic strengths that accounted for Buffalo's success in the past continue to augur well for the future—a moderate climate with four distinctly enjoyable seasons, access to an inexhaustible supply of fresh water, a vast intermodal transportation network, a pool of skilled workers, and a location strategically set among the population centers of the Northeast, Midwest, and Canada.

Efforts in recent years have helped Buffalo to improve the condition of some of its assets, like Lake Erie and

the Niagara River, and add new ones, like a new downtown convention center, hotel developments, a new naval park, and museum.

New developments associated with the light rail rapid transit line under construction, such as creation of a theater district and finalization of plans for a downtown pedestrian mall that will be one of the largest in the world, prompt renewed confidence.

But perhaps our greatest asset is the current strong community interest, in both the public and private sectors, to sustain this revitalization effort.

A strong local economic development planning and coordination program is underway to retain existing industry and attract new diversified growth firms, particularly in the high technology field. As it observes its 150th birthday, therefore, Buffalo looks forward eagerly to the future. Capturing that community optimism, Buffalo's slogan is: Talking Proud.

The slogan is relatively new but, in fact, Buffalo has been talking and acting proudly for decades. The birthday wish today is that it will continue to do so for many more to come.●

WEST GERMANY COMMUNIST PARTY MANIPULATES "PEACE GROUPS"

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following New York Times article to my colleagues regarding the West German Communist Party's influence and manipulation of so-called peace movements in that country. Ironically, the charge was not made by a conservative figure, rather by an extreme left wing organizer of the Greens, an environmental party in West Germany. Petra Kelly of the Green Party, herself a known anti-American leader of demonstrations against NATO, has described the Communist tactics at a recent meeting of leftist groups.

The article follows:

ANTIMISSILE GROUP IN BONN IS DIVIDED—ENVIRONMENTAL PART CHARGES COMMUNISTS MANIPULATED PARLEY PLANNING PROTEST

(By John Vincour)

Bonn, April 5.—A major rift concerning possible Communist influence developed today among groups opposing NATO's plan for deploying new nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

One of the leading component organizations charged that the West German Communist Party, which is aligned with Moscow, dominated and manipulated a meeting here Sunday in which representatives of 37 groups, describing themselves as elements of the antimissile movement, planned a major demonstration against

President Reagan when he visits Bonn for a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization June 10.

The accusation was made by the group known as the Greens, an environmentalist party that has become increasingly active in left-wing politics in West Germany, winning seats in several state parliaments in the last two years. The Greens have acknowledged that members of their party cooperate with the Communists on certain local issues, but they described the meeting here as scandalous.

The Greens' charges were the first public substantiation from inside the antinuclear movement of statements by some West German politicians that the West German Communist Party, at the direction of the Soviet Union, has attempted to co-opt public sentiment against nuclear weapons.

Ulrich Tost, a member of the Greens' federal council, told a reporter: "The Communists dominated the meeting completely. It took place under seemingly democratic rules, but that was a joke. We could barely get a word in."

800 ATTENDED MEETING

Petra Kelly, another federal council member, said there had been a large group at the meeting, which was attended by 800 people, who were there "only to help a certain bloc"—a reference to the Soviet Union.

Soviet nuclear missiles were completely excluded as a cause of tension in the resolutions produced by the delegates, which blamed the United States for almost all the world's troubles.

The Greens said at a news conference that they still planned to participate in the demonstration here when Mr. Reagan arrives, but that they were considering under what circumstances and how they could differentiate themselves from the goals agreed upon by the 37 groups on Sunday.

The Greens were the second major group in the antinuclear movement to have expressed concern about participation. Action for Reconciliation, the church-led organization that organized an antinuclear demonstration here last fall attended by about 250,000 people, has so far kept clear of involvement. Estimates for the possible size of the June 10 demonstration have ranged between 100,000 and 500,000.

BLAME ASSIGNED TO COMMUNISTS

"Mr. Reagan can come to Bonn completely relaxed now," Mrs. Kelly was quoted as saying after the meeting on Sunday. "This peace movement has shown itself incapable of discussion." If the movement should be split, she said today, it would be the fault of the West German Communist Party.

When she was asked why the Greens had been unable to combat the Communists at the organizational meeting, Mrs. Kelly replied, "It is not our style to work in this centralized fashion."

At the meeting Sunday, the delegates approved a resolution describing the goal of the NATO conference as "support of the Reagan Administration's attempt to achieve worldwide hegemony."

The goals of the Greens, Mrs. Kelly said, are "a nonaligned peace movement" calling for a Europe without nuclear weapons and the dissolution of the power blocs, East and West.

The participants in Sunday's meeting rejected separate resolutions calling on the antimissile movement to use only nonviolent methods in demonstrations, condemning Soviet interference in Poland and Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, and expressing

support for the Solidarity labor union in Poland.

U.S. ACTIONS CONDEMNED

They adopted, however, by a large majority, a motion condemning United States actions in Central America, the Middle East, southern Africa and other regions. The NATO session was dismissed as "a challenge to all people who support peace and concrete disarmament plans."

Among the groups represented at the meeting, in addition to the Greens and the Communist Party, were the Federal Association of Environmental Citizens' Initiatives, the German Student Federation, the Evangelical Student Committee, the Federation of Christian Youth Groups and the German Peace Society, an organization described by the Government's Office for the Protection of the Constitution as being under Communist influence.●

TWENTY-NINE PALMS RESERVATION

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize the addition of Twenty-nine Palms Bank of Luisena Mission Indians to the list of those tribes permitted to lease trust lands for 99 years.

Conventionally, Indian trust land may be leased for periods of up to 25 years with an option to renew for an additional 25 years. Exceptions to this practice have in the past been authorized by statute on a case-by-case basis primarily for the purpose of facilitating commercial development for the benefit of the leasing tribe. It is such an exception that this legislation would create.

The southern portion of Twenty-nine Palms reservation, arid and unsuitable for either agrarian enterprise or human habitation, lies adjacent to the Valley Sanitary District. The existing Valley Sanitary District treatment facility must expand to meet the burgeoning demands for waste disposal of the city of Indio, but is limited by the nonavailability of space in the area it serves.

The tribe desires to lease to the Valley Sanitary District an otherwise nonproductive parcel adjacent to the VSD facility, thereby converting this wasted space into a sizable economic benefit to the tribe. The tribe plans to use the proceeds of this lease for much needed housing and business development. However, both parties agree that such a facility should have the semipermanency a 99-year lease would afford. Hence, the need for this legislation.

I strongly support providing this opportunity to permit beneficial use of the meager resources of this reservation to provide revenue for develop-

ment of the reservation, and for the benefit of the neighboring community as well.

I am advised that the Secretary of the Interior supports this legislation. I urge early adoption of this bill.●

THE USE OF PLASTIC BULLETS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I have been deeply concerned for some time about the use of plastic bullets by security forces in Northern Ireland.

My concerns were heightened last October when our committee conducted a special meeting where two distinguished Irish Americans from New York who participated in an international tribunal in Belfast on the use of plastic bullets condemned their indiscriminate use by security forces. They presented data which showed that 7 persons were killed by the bullets and another 160 seriously injured. What was even more disturbing was the fact that of the seven fatalities—five were children under the age of 15.

I am a former law enforcement officer for 23 years in the city of New York and I know the meaning of reasonable force. A plastic bullet is a crowd control device—it is supposed to be fired into the ground to disperse. If it in fact is to make contact with a person—it is supposed to hit the person in the leg and not result in serious injury. However—in a number of the cases where fatalities and serious injuries were reported—the bullets were fired from pointblank range striking the person in the upper torso.

According to a brief article in today's New York Daily News—Steven McConomy age 11 died yesterday of injuries suffered when he was struck in the head by a British Army plastic bullet during riots in Londonderry Northern Ireland.

The article filed by the Associated Press continued:

The boy was hit last Friday when troops fired two plastic bullets to disperse 30 to 40 youths who had been stoning them in the Bogside district.

I again call upon the British Government to end their indiscriminate use of plastic bullets on civilians in Northern Ireland. My position is consistent with my overall abhorrence of all violence in Northern Ireland whether carried on by civilians or by those in law enforcement. Violence remains the primary obstacle to peace in Northern Ireland and its end should be a goal by all those concerned with the future of Ireland.●

PROCLAMATION—REMEMBERING THE HOLOCAUST

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, today is the Jewish day of remembrance, Yom Hashoa V'hagvurah, which seeks to commemorate the years of holocaust and trepidation faced by the Jews and others during the Nazi era. While the ever-present and never-ending lessons of this most tragic period of human history are and should be recalled every day, April 20 has been set aside as a special day of reflection. While most of today's youth have nothing but an abstract knowledge of the Holocaust and all that it entailed, Yom Hashoa is designed to prevent anyone from forgetting just what a miserable act this event really was.

The time-honored adage about history's tendency to be repeated if its lessons are unlearned rings true; if society is permitted to forget about the organized extermination of millions, then the field will become fertile once again for its reoccurrence.

The lesson of the Holocaust remains: The sanctity of the individual and the sacredness of human life must never be negated by any individual or state. Religious freedom must endure, and be protected. Racism must not be tolerated, and the tendency to blame groups for paradoxical turns in the economy must not be allowed to grow. The Holocaust of the Nazi era will only be prevented from reoccurring if its sobering lessons are truly learned.

The American Federation of Jewish Fighters, Camp Inmates, and Nazi Victims; the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Council have sponsored a proclamation setting forth the lessons that continually need to be learned from the Holocaust. I reprint this proclamation along with a listing of groups which have lent their good names in cosponsorship of this proclamation:

PROCLAMATION—DAY OF REMEMBRANCE—YOM HASHOA V'HAGVURAH FOR JEWISH MARTYRDOM AND RESISTANCE, APRIL 20, 1982, 27TH DAY OF NISSAN

Whereas, the Knesset of the State of Israel and Jewish Communities throughout the world have proclaimed the 27th Day of Nissan, corresponding this year to April 20, 1982, as a Day of Remembrance of the Martyrdom of 6 million of our people who perished in the European Holocaust and as a Day of Tribute to Jewish Heroism and

Whereas, it is our obligation to perpetuate and keep alive the memory of our Martyrs—Kedoshim—and pay Tribute to our Heroes; and

Whereas, we pay tribute to the Heroism of Jewish servicemen, to the underground fighters, to the heroic stand of the besieged

fighters of the ghettos who rose and kindled the flame of revolt in honor of their people; and

Whereas, the ancient Jewish dictum "Thou shall tell thy son" offers meaningful assurance for Jewish survival in the tradition of our people; and

Whereas, our brethren in Israel and Jews throughout the world will gather on this assigned day to commemorate the Holocaust and pay tribute to Jewish Heroism;

Now therefore, we—the undersigned—representing our organizations and the Jewish Community, proclaim the evening of Monday, April 19, and Tuesday, April 20, 1982, corresponding to the 27th Day of Nissan, as a Day of Remembrance and Observance.

We call upon all Jews to assemble in their synagogues and other appropriate places of assembly to commemorate the heroic deeds of our people in the European catastrophe.

This day must become one of National Observance and Commemoration in our times, in our synagogues, in our schools and any other places of assembly.

We call upon Rabbis and Community Leaders to make this day a Day of Observance for the entire community and to become a permanent Day of Observance from year to year.

Keep the Day of Martyrdom and Heroism Holy.

Remember the 6 million.

Light a memorial candle to their memory in your home on Monday evening, April 19, 1982.

PROCLAMATION SPONSORS—1982

American Federation of Jewish Fighters, Camp Inmates, and Nazi Victims.

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations.

United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

American Association for Jewish Education.

American Federation of Jews from Central Europe.

American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

American Mizrahi Women.

American Section of the World Jewish Congress.

American Zionist Federation.

American Zionist Youth Council.

Americans for Progressive Israel Hashomer Hatzair.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Association of Reform Zionists of America.

Betar.

B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations.

B'nai B'rith Youth Organization.

B'nai Zion.

B'nei Akiva of North America.

Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York.

Center for Russian Jewry—SSSJ.

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Central Queens Council of Orthodox Synagogues.

Columbia University Council of Jewish Organizations.

Committee for the Rescue of Jews in Arab Lands.

Dror.

Emunah Women of America.

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Federation of Polish Jews.

Gesher Foundation.

Hadassah—The Women's Zionist Organization of America.

Hadassah Zionist Youth Commission.
 Hamagshimim.
 Haschachar—Young Judea.
 Ichud Habonim.
 Jewish Community Relations Council,
 New York.
 Jewish Cultural Clubs and Societies.
 Jewish Labor Committee.
 Jewish Ministers Cantor's Association of
 America.
 Jewish National Fund.
 Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation.
 Jewish Resistance Organization.
 Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
 Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A.—Depart-
 ment of N.Y.
 Labor Zionist Alliance—Farband.
 N.Y. City Farband—Labor Zionist Alli-
 ance.
 Leo Baeck Institute.
 Masada of the Zionist Organization of
 America.
 Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.
 Mizrahi—Hapoel Hamizrachi.
 National Committee for the Furtherance
 of Jewish Education.
 National Committee for Labor Israel.
 National Conference on Soviet Jewry.
 National Conference of Synagogue Youth.
 National Council of Jewish Legislators.
 National Council of Young Israel.
 National Federation of Temple Sister-
 hoods.
 National Federation of Temple Youth.
 National Jewish Conference Center.
 National Jewish Community Relations
 Advisory Council.
 The New York Board of Rabbis.
 Noam—Noar Mizrahi.
 North American Jewish Students' Net-
 work.
 Poalei Agudath Israel of America.
 Rabbinical Council of America.
 Survivors of the Riga Ghetto.
 Theodor Herzl Institute.
 Torah Umesorah—National Society for
 Hebrew Day Schools.
 Touro College.
 Union of American Hebrew Congrega-
 tions.
 Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations
 of America.
 United Hungarian Jews of America.
 United Synagogue of America.
 United Synagogue of America—New York
 Metropolitan Region.
 United Zionist Revisionists of America.
 WAGRO—Warsaw Ghetto Resistance Or-
 ganization.
 World Jewish Congress.
 World Zionist Organization—American
 Section.
 Yavneh.
 Yeshiva University.
 Young Israel Intercollegiate Council.
 Zionist Organization of America.●

VIETNAM: THE TRUTH BEGINS TO EMERGE

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, the fol-
 lowing two articles appeared in the
 Wall Street Journal on April 1, 1982:

VIETNAM REVISITED

Norman Podhoretz has done it again, visit-
 ing an epidemic of apoplexy upon Manhat-
 tan's literary salons.

"Norman Podhoretz Breaks a Leg," reads
 the headline on the review of his new book
 in The Village Voice. "Our West side mini-
 Spengler" sneers Arthur Schlesinger Jr. in
 Harper's. "A potted historian," fumes Theo-
 dore Draper in The New Republic. Those
 who move from one side of the debate to
 the other, writes James Fallows in the New
 York Times Book Review, "are not entitled
 to self-righteousness and venom."

The self-righteousness and venom of the
 critics is directed at Mr. Podhoretz's new
 book, "Why We Were in Vietnam," in which
 he writes that Vietnam was a moral war.
 The author will survive, though for the
 moment he professes to be quaking under
 the assault. His critics' most telling point is
 that the book never mentions he once held
 the antiwar opinions he now attacks; his
 reply is that he wrote a whole book, "Break-
 ing Ranks," about his personal conversion
 two years ago. To judge by the history of
 Mr. Podhoretz's previous books, the critics'
 slings and arrows will leave him bleeding all
 the way to the bank.

But more is involved here. It is not merely
 the author's special talent at enraging liter-
 ary beasts. It is more importantly the
 matter of the subject. Mr. Draper worries
 about "a corrosive campaign to reopen the
 wounds of the war and envenom American
 political life once again," about "a stab-in-
 the-back legend of the kind that haunted
 the German Weimar Republic." In plainer
 words, the objection is to any reconsid-
 eration of the popular history of the Vietnam
 war, to any challenge to the established lit-
 erary wisdom that the problem in Vietnam
 was American immorality, military incompe-
 tence and government duplicity.

Yet for all the obstacles that are placed in
 its way, such a reconsideration is plainly
 gathering steam. It is not merely one
 author, neither in terms of the impulse to
 reexamine nor in terms of the controversy
 engendered.

Last August in Encounter, for example,
 veteran reporter Robert Elegant wrote a re-
 consideration, offering the thesis that the
 U.S. and South Vietnamese more or less
 won the war on the ground, but that misre-
 porting by the press turned this into a
 defeat on the home front. CBS Vietnam star
 Morley Safer denounced him with a series
 of cheap shots—for example, "should appeal
 to what few admirers are left of the late Dr.
 Joseph Goebbels."

The Army War College at Carlisle Bar-
 racks has just published a quite remarkable
 monograph, "On Strategy: The Vietnam
 War in Context" by Col. Harry G. Summers
 Jr. Like Mr. Elegant, Col. Summers ponders
 the paradox of "tactical victory, strategic
 defeat." But he blames neither the press
 nor the people. "The main reason it is not
 right to blame the American public is that
 President Lyndon Baines Johnson made a
 conscious decision not to mobilize the Amer-
 ican people," he writes. "Having deliber-
 ately never been built, it could hardly be said
 that the nation's will 'collapsed.'" Col. Sum-
 mers's study proved highly controversial
 within the Army, as reflected in a stand-
 offish introduction by a former Carlisle Bar-
 racks commandant.

It is perhaps too early to say precisely
 where the reconsideration will lead, precise-
 ly what are the lessons of Vietnam. But it is
 certainly not too early to say that the popu-
 lar history needs to be rewritten. The con-
 ventional wisdom has everything wrong.

Most spectacularly, of course, American
 withdrawal and South Vietnamese defeat
 did not "stop the war" or "end the killing."

The antiwar movement got what it wanted.
 But today Vietnam is a vast Gulag. Cambo-
 dia witnessed a bloodbath by any definition.
 The boat people cry for attention, but mor-
 alists look away. The Vietnamese continue
 the war, with the latest gruesome twist of
 "yellow rain," turning lungs into gushers of
 blood.

The much-maligned domino theory has
 been vindicated by experience; El Salvador
 totters today. We now know that militarily
 the 1968 Tet offensive was a huge North Vi-
 etnamese defeat; reporters scoffed when
 General Westmoreland told them so at the
 time. The war was not won by guerrillas; it
 was decided by a tank-led invasion across
 borders. As for duplicity and deception,
 anyone who didn't understand we were
 going into a war must have lived on another
 planet. All these misunderstandings need to
 be rewritten.

As the reconsideration proceeds, we
 expect that two even more shocking points
 will emerge—the two points most feared by
 those who want to freeze opinion here and
 now. First, Vietnam was a liberal intellectu-
 al war; specifically, it was a Kennedy admin-
 istration war. Second, there was no slippery
 slope; we stepped over a cliff.

The first of these Mr. Podhoretz is on to,
 which accounts for many of the outraged
 screams. He has delicious pro-Vietnam
 quotes from Senator and President John F.
 Kennedy, from the editorial columns of the
 New York Times, from Senator Fulbright
 and Senator Church. He remarks how the
 antiwar coalition came to include "people
 who led the country into Vietnam in the
 first place and were eager to atone by lead-
 ing it out."

What Mr. Podhoretz misses—and for that
 Mr. Elegant and Col. Summers as well—is
 the central importance of the 1963 coup
 against Ngo Dinh Diem. In sanctioning this
 coup we plunged into Vietnam. Yes, we had
 helped establish Diem in 1954. Yes, we had
 military advisers there earlier. Yes, the big
 troop movements waited until 1965. But
 when we overthrew an ally in the name of
 winning the war, we were committing our-
 selves to a real effort to stay the course.
 This is where our commitment outran our
 interests. And three weeks after the coup
 President Kennedy was dead, with Presi-
 dent Johnson left to pick up the pieces.

These events are what especially need to
 be understood, and have been especially
 clouded by those who got their way about
 Diem. We recently ran an article on Viet-
 nam and El Salvador by David Halberstam,
 which struck us as a time capsule from Oc-
 tober of 1963, explaining how overthrowing
 Diem won the war. We were delighted that
 Reed Irvine of Accuracy in Media wrote to
 recommend a contrary account, "Our Viet-
 nam Nightmare," by the late Marguerite
 Higgins. This surely is a text to be weighed
 in any reconsideration of the war.

We are still at an early stage. The time is
 only now ripening to start to look again at
 so searing a national experience. The les-
 sons can only gradually be sorted out. Mr.
 Podhoretz's book is not the last word, and
 not even quite the first shot. But it is a good
 loud bang, the starting gun for a new
 debate. This is a good thing. For all the pain
 it will cause, we surely do need another look
 at our Vietnam experience.

REALITIES AND MYTHS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

(By Robert W. Kagan)

Everyone agrees that the United States
 should never again commit the errors of

Vietnam. It is much harder to decide exactly what those errors were. And at a time of widespread fear that El Salvador will become "another Vietnam," the popular discourse is dominated by some fundamental misconceptions about our involvement in Southeast Asia.

In "Why We Were in Vietnam" (Simon & Schuster, 256 pages, \$14.50), Norman Podhoretz, the editor of *Commentary* magazine, tries to clear up many of these misconceptions, particularly the notion that American involvement was somehow immoral. On the contrary, he shows that the moral justification of American participation was clear from the start and was vindicated overwhelmingly by subsequent history.

Mr. Podhoretz shows that in the early 1960s U.S. sentiment was nearly unanimous in favor of defending South Vietnam against a Communist attack. Many who supported the war then later joined the antiwar movement or escaped from public view. But in the late 1950s and early 1960s America was still following a policy of containment, and the same people who had supported a war in Korea to stop the spread of Communism beyond the World War II boundaries also supported the defense of non-Communist South Vietnam.

In 1956, Sen. John F. Kennedy called Vietnam "the cornerstone of the Free World in Southeast Asia." Sen. Mike Mansfield, later an ardent critic of the war, praised the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem for having "taken what was a lost cause of freedom and breathed new life into it." In 1965, after America's involvement in the war had vastly increased, Sen. Frank Church defended the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which he would later condemn: "There is a time to question the route of the flag, and there is a time to rally around it lest it be routed. This is the time for the latter course."

THE MOTIVES ARE EXEMPLARY

David Halberstam of the New York Times wrote in 1965 that "Vietnam is a legitimate part of the [U.S.] global commitment . . . perhaps one of only five or six nations in the world that are truly vital to U.S. interests. If it is that important, it may be worth a larger commitment on our part. . . ." And the Times itself proclaimed in an editorial that "The Americans went into Vietnam . . . to contain the advance of communism in that part of Southeast Asia. The motives are exemplary and every American could be proud of them. . . ."

Ironically, 15 years later presidential candidate Ronald Reagan called the Vietnam war a "noble cause" and set off titters throughout America's better educated set. After 1965, motives that had been "exemplary" came to be considered "immoral." How and why this turnabout took place are complicated questions that Mr. Podhoretz tries to answer.

There were many good reasons to have become unhappy with the war. One was the growing realization that winning it might not be possible at any price. Each year hundreds of thousands of American troops went into Vietnam: 50,000 died, for little obvious military advantage.

Traditional American methods of warfare were badly suited to the kind of war that had to be fought in Vietnam. As Henry Kissinger put it, "Wars of attrition cannot be won against an enemy who refuses to fight except on his own terms. The Vietnamese terrain, the nature of guerrilla warfare, the existence of sanctuaries, all combined to make it impossible for [General] Westmoreland to wear down his adversary as he

sought." According to Mr. Podhoretz, the American way of war was "stupid . . . in the context of Vietnam where it served to arouse the hostility of the very people whose 'hearts and minds' were being courted and whose support was a necessary ingredient of victory."

The Diem regime was further cause for disenchantment. Notwithstanding the early praise of Sen. Mansfield, Mr. Podhoretz writes that Diem soon engaged in "whole-sale suppression of political opposition" and "followed policies in the countryside that alienated the peasantry." While the Diem regime was superior to what the North had to offer, the moral case for defending it was more ambiguous than in 1956, when John F. Kennedy had called South Vietnam the "proving ground for democracy in Asia."

Mr. Podhoretz argues that the war was an imprudent venture from the start. "The only way the United States could have avoided defeat in Vietnam," he claims, "was by staying out of the war altogether." He applies to Vietnam what Dean Acheson said in a 1949 White Paper on the loss of China: "The unfortunate but inescapable fact is that the ominous result . . . was beyond the control of the government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result."

But if American involvement was merely imprudent, how did the war gain its reputation as an unforgivable atrocity? Surely the hellishness of the fighting cannot explain it. Korea and World War II were as bad or worse. Even anti-war Daniel Ellsberg wrote in 1970 that Vietnam was "no more brutal than other wars in the past."

Mr. Podhoretz argues that there were actually two wars during the Vietnam years: one for Southeast Asia, the other for the "hearts and minds" of the American people. If the war in Vietnam was a perpetual stalemate, the war at home was a rout.

On one side were the successive administrations that conducted the war: Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. According to Mr. Podhoretz, each tried to fight the war "on the cheap." They tried to avoid hard decisions by increasing American involvement in gradual increments. More important, they tried to do it all without soliciting public support for the war. "To be fought successfully, the war had to have a convincing moral justification, and the failure to provide one doomed the entire enterprise."

The moral arguments were left largely to the war's critics who, by the time Nixon was elected in 1968, had formed a grand alliance of diverse groups, mixing the Old and New Left, the liberal anti-Communists and the Stalinists, as well as former members of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Judging from Mr. Podhoretz's account, one cannot avoid thinking that the chief victims of this war at home were truth and integrity. Some of the lies and deceptions came from American leaders, but these were exceeded in number and severity by the war's critics. Not content to criticize American's foolishness for fighting an unwinnable war of uncertain strategic importance, many of the antiwar people set out to prove that America was immoral, that the South Vietnamese government was evil, that we were, in Frances Fitzgerald's words, on the "wrong side" in the war.

Over and over, the critics said the war in South Vietnam was merely a "civil war," an indigenous rebellion independent of the Hanoi government. This interpretation was

swallowed whole and many still regard it as the truth. But, as Mr. Podhoretz notes, it "was not true at the beginning; and as for the end, this civil war conducted (according to the Committee of Concern Asian Scholars) by 'the largely peasant forces of South Vietnam' was won when North Vietnam, finally dropping all pretense, sent a huge regular army into the South and then proceeded to impose its rule without so much as a nod in the direction, let alone the participation, of the Southerners." Today not one member of the Politburo or the 134-member Vietnamese Communist Party is from the old, South Vietnamese. National Liberation Front.

Just as fervent were the claims that the Diem government, and all those that succeeded it in South Vietnam, was worse than the Communist alternative. Mary McCarthy, Frances Fitzgerald and the recently repentant Susan Sontag all wrote tributes to the "moral beauty" of the Hanoi government that today tyrannizes over much of Indochina.

Vietnam's present government has brought about, in Tom Wicker's words, "a vast tide of human misery in Southeast Asia." Refugees and "boat people" have been fleeing by hundreds of thousands from what Nguyen Cong Hoan, a former NLF politician, has called "the most inhuman and oppressive regime they have ever known." The former Minister of Justice of the NLF's Provisional Revolutionary Government, Truong Nho Tang, said after fleeing in 1979, "Never has any previous regime brought such masses of people to such desperation. Not the military dictators, not the colonialists, not even the ancient Chinese overlords," yet these revelations have swayed only some of those who once welcomed communism for the Vietnamese and denounced the U.S. for opposing it. In Mr. Podhoretz's opinion, "Such writers should have known enough about the history of communism to know better, and they should now be ashamed of their naivete and of the contribution they made to the victory of forces they had a moral duty to oppose."

MR. SALISBURY'S FALSE CHARGES

Other assaults on the truth included the grossly inaccurate and deceptive reporting of the Tet offensive, and Harrison Salisbury's false charges of American bombing of civilian targets, the evidence for which Mr. Salisbury cribbed from a North Vietnamese propaganda pamphlet.

The combined effect of all these falsehoods was that the truth about America's involvement in the war was turned inside out. We went in for reasons based ultimately on morality, to defend a country from the horrors of modern totalitarianism. We went in, as Mr. Podhoretz argues, "for the sake of an ideal." "The intervention was a product of the Wilsonian side of the American character—the side that went to war in 1917 to 'make the world safe for democracy' and that found its contemporary incarnation in the liberal internationalism of the 1940s and the liberal anticommunism of the 1950s. One can characterize this impulse as naive; one can describe it in terms that gave it a subtly self-interested flavor. But there is no rationally defensible way in which it can be called immoral."

Mr. Podhoretz has performed a valuable service by clearing away much of the deceptive rhetoric of the Vietnam period. No doubt he will arouse the ire of those he has embarrassed in the process. But his book is important, for it disposes of myths and

falsehoods that have to be set aside if we are to understand the real errors of Vietnam.

Perhaps one lesson of that war is that Wilsonian idealism should not overrule prudence and self-interest in foreign policy, even when the cause is just. Yet another may be that communism really does turn out to be worse than other bad forms of government, no matter how much critics of American policy may try to deny it.

Lionel Trilling, in his introduction to George Orwell's "Homage to Catalonia," wrote of the left-liberal intellectuals' angry reaction to the truths that Orwell brought back from Spain: "They were committed not to the fact but to the abstraction. And to the abstraction they remained committed for a long time to come." Let us hope this will not be true of Vietnam.●

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES AGREEMENTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1981

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following chart which lists foreign military sales agreements concluded by the United States during fiscal year 1981 which ended September 30, 1981.

This table, prepared by the Defense Security Assistance Agency, shows a worldwide total of \$8.5 billion from the sale of defense articles and services during the year. This figure compares with totals for fiscal year 1979 of \$13.01 billion and for fiscal year 1980 of \$15.2 billion. In recent testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, the Secretary of Defense confirmed estimates of at least \$25 billion for new FMS agreements in fiscal year 1982, the current year.

It should be noted that these figures represent new FMS, Government-to-Government agreements which were signed during the fiscal year and do not represent deliveries or U.S. credit financing levels, nor do the totals include commercial purchases.

The table follows:

Total value of defense articles and services sold to each country during the period Oct. 1, 1980 to Sept. 30, 1981 under foreign military sales

(In millions of dollars)

Australia.....	462.3
Austria.....	7.3
Bahrain.....	.1
Barbados.....	(¹)
Belgium.....	38.2
Brazil.....	4.3
Brunei.....	.2
Burma.....	.8
Cameroon.....	1.5
Canada.....	146.5
Colombia.....	8.2
Denmark.....	28.8

Total value of defense articles and services sold to each country during the period Oct. 1, 1980 to Sept. 30, 1981 under foreign military sales—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Dominican Republic.....	.2
Ecuador.....	13.1
Egypt.....	550.8
El Salvador.....	13.9
Fiji.....	1.4
Finland.....	.2
France.....	14.7
Germany.....	247.1
Ghana.....	.1
Greece.....	197.0
Guatemala.....	(¹)
Honduras.....	4.3
India.....	.2
Indonesia.....	45.1
Ireland.....	(¹)
Israel.....	136.9
Italy.....	225.9
Jamaica.....	(¹)
Japan.....	566.8
Jordan.....	368.8
Kenya.....	25.0
Korea.....	384.4
Kuwait.....	45.9
Lebanon.....	51.8
Liberia.....	3.5
Luxembourg.....	.4
Madagascar.....	(¹)
Malaysia.....	37.7
Mexico.....	107.6
Morocco.....	48.0
Netherlands.....	378.1
New Zealand.....	19.3
Nigeria.....	6.6
Norway.....	54.2
Oman.....	50.8
Pakistan.....	62.3
Panama.....	.4
Paraguay.....	(¹)
Peru.....	5.2
Philippines.....	5.8
Portugal.....	20.8
Qatar.....	(¹)
Rwanda.....	2.0
Saudi Arabia.....	² 2,149.0
Singapore.....	51.2
Somalia.....	41.1
Spain.....	132.3
Sudan.....	42.9
Sweden.....	29.0
Switzerland.....	320.1
Taiwan.....	228.0
Thailand.....	158.0
Trinidad-Tobago.....	(¹)
Tunisia.....	22.2
Turkey.....	333.8
United Arab Emirates.....	18.8
United Kingdom.....	338.6
Uruguay.....	.7
Venezuela.....	73.4
Yemen.....	17.8
Yugoslavia.....	10.9
Zaire.....	6.7
International organizations.....	156.6
Total.....	8,525.5

¹ Less than \$50,000.

² Includes \$876 million of construction projects requested by the Government of Saudi Arabia.

Note: Data may not add due to rounding.●

LONG ISLAND CELEBRATES JEWISH HERITAGE WEEK

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues a most significant event taking place on Long Island, N.Y.

On Sunday, April 25, the date marking the beginning of Jewish Heritage Week, the Conference of Jewish Organizations of Nassau and Suffolk Counties joins with Adelphi University in a major celebration of this most important observance.

As I am sure my colleagues are aware, Jewish Heritage Week is an observance of major import to our Nation. It gives all Americans the opportunity to better understand and appreciate the major spiritual, cultural, and intellectual contributions those of the Jewish faith have brought to our great country, and to the world. This heritage, the fruit of thousands of years of striving and effort on the part of hundreds of generations of Jews is a priceless one indeed.

Jewish Heritage Week has been designated specifically for this period to commemorate events which represent both great joy and great sorrow for the Jewish community. The months of April and May contain such significant dates in Jewish life as Passover, today's Remembrance of the Holocaust, Israel's Independence Day, Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry, and Jerusalem Day.

On Long Island, the Conference of Jewish Organizations of Nassau and Suffolk Counties is devoting Sunday afternoon, April 25, to a panoply of events which will help Long Islanders better appreciate the many aspects of Jewish heritage.

The program will feature Israeli singing and dancing; a musical play, illustrating the values imbued in Jewish children, and recollections of the early Jewish presence on Long Island.

As the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District, which encompasses a portion of Nassau County on Long Island, I want to offer my congratulations to the Conference of Jewish Organizations of Nassau and Suffolk Counties which have planned and sponsored this imaginative and exciting tribute to the Jewish heritage. My congratulations also to leaders such as Jo Amer, president of the Conference of Jewish Organizations of Nassau County, and to Tobie Newman, its executive director. Their leadership continues to play a significant role in Jewish life in Nassau County.

The events on Long Island Sunday will communicate to the non-Jewish

residents of Long Island a better understanding of the great history, traditions, and cultural achievements of those of the Jewish faith, and will emphasize the fact that the Jewish heritage has greatly enriched every facet of American life and played a notable part in the 200-year history of growth of our great Nation.

Even more, the events on Long Island this Sunday afternoon should inspire all of us to renew our dedication to the cause of human rights, assisting those like the Soviet Jews fighting against persecution and oppression, and should inspire us to reaffirm our dedication to the independence and security of Israel.

May the inspirational qualities of Jewish Heritage Week remain with us through the year. ●

DONALD LAMBRO ON: MORE OF—WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have had much to say this day with regard to the use and abuse of the taxpayers' money. I also made the observation that if some of the organizations receiving your money and mine from our pocketbooks, were to solicit in the private sector, they would soon go broke.

Now comes Donald Lambro, the distinguished and able author of "Fat City," to confirm that assessment I made. Donald Lambro had a prominent Washington, D.C., attorney make the observation concerning these organizations, that, "Their traditional sources of financing were drying up, so the only place left to look (for support) to is the Government." Mr. Lambro makes this and other shocking observations in an article titled: "The Grantsmanship Game: Funding The Liberal Interests—Leftists Win, Taxpayers Lose." It appeared in the April 1982 Conservative Digest.

What is particularly galling about Mr. Lambro's piece is the fact that not only the Congress has been negligent in calling for an accountability of where hard-working taxpayers' money is going, but that this money is being used blatantly by special interest groups to lobby this body for more and more money. It would appear that the Department of Justice should be moving on this issue.

I do not think that my fellow colleagues would spend their own money to fund such things as the "cultural and management practices for (the) Chinese tallow tree as a biomass fuel source," to the tune of \$52,600. Mr. Lambro points to the solution by having President Reagan's Office of

Management and Budget, " * * * undertake a wall-to-wall housecleaning of every grant, award, and contract that has been issued in the current fiscal year." I think that we legislators could supplement this recommendation by exercising our power of the pursestrings and refuse to appropriate the money in the first place. Mr. Lambro's article from the April 1982 Conservative Digest follows:

THE GRANTSMANSHIP GAME: FUNDING THE LIBERAL INTERESTS—LEFTISTS WIN, TAXPAYERS LOSE

(By Donald Lambro)

America's political rhetoric is saturated with bitter condemnation of the rise of the special interest lobbies.

Overlooked almost entirely, however, is the fact that the federal government has been generously financing them year after year—with our money.

Spend a few days poring over the government's computer printouts of its grants, awards and contracts, and you will readily see what I mean.

Washington has been subsidizing thousands of groups, organizations, institutes, think tanks, associations, academics, lobbyists, political crusaders, consumerists, feminists—you name it.

In fact, it is difficult to find any organization that is not receiving federal funds for one purpose or another—from the YMCA to the National Football League.

In most cases the bureaucrats who approve the hundreds of millions of dollars that go to these special interest recipients haven't the slightest idea exactly how the money they shovel out will be spent.

There is little if any monitoring of how the funds are expended or who benefits from their expenditure. Often the funds end up paying for some report or study which no one will ever read.

"Essentially, it's a public jobs program for special interest groups," said one savvy contract officer in the Department of Education.

Although the staffs of many of these groups are almost totally financed by federal grants and contracts, they are rarely if ever examined by Congress to see how they have spent their funds and what the taxpayers have received in return.

Yet these funds have often been used to influence federal legislation and government policies, lobby legislatures, bring law suits against states and municipalities, and mount political pressure on everything from food stamps to abortions.

As fatter grants and contracts became available during the 1970s, many of these so-called advocacy groups began to establish tax-exempt spin-off groups or so-called education and research conduits through which they funneled their federal dollars.

My own investigation into this shadowy world of federally bankrolled special interests revealed a seemingly endless list of subsidized organizations—from the U.S. Lawn Tennis Association to the Americans for Democratic Action.

Many of them, such as the National Governors Association, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, or the National Association of Counties have million dollar-plus budgets. They occupy huge office complexes in Washington, pay their officers exceedingly well, and use their federally-financed staffs to lobby the government in behalf of their demands—in

favor of bigger budgets, expanded programs, and more federal aid.

Curiously, the people who run their enterprises do not attempt to hide the fact that they are lobbying with the help of federal tax dollars. While researching my book, *FAT CITY: How Washington Wastes Your Taxes*, I talked with a National Governors Association official about the purposes of his organization.

"There's no question that we are here to get more money for these programs (revenue sharing, block grants, etc.)," he said, pointing out that the research being done in-house with federal funds was often "valuable to governors as lobbyists" when they push for federal program expansion before Congress.

Are these grants and funding projects worthwhile? The many groups and wealthy organizations who relentlessly hunt for these federal dollars obviously think they are. Yet among some of those who staff these groups, there is an occasional blunt assessment: "I happen to believe that a lot of it (grants) is a crock," one group official told me. "But we didn't build the system. The Feds built it and we have to play the game, otherwise we would be opting out to the other special interest."

Thus, the predatory nature of the "grantsmanship game" is to beat the other special interests to the federal bucks or be beaten.

Reviewing the multitude of contracts, grants and awards for fiscal 1981, one is immediately struck by the prolific numbers or organizations feeding at the federal trough. Interestingly enough, many of the same names appear again and again on various listings from agency to agency.

This is because the government is a veritable supermarket of grants and contracts. And the special interest groups are out shopping for every dollar they can lay their hands on.

The only problem is that much of what the American taxpayer is buying is worthless, or at the very least of extremely low priority in terms of national social needs. Consider some recent examples from the Department of Energy:

A \$13,689 grant to Minorities Organized for Energy of Silver Spring, Md. to participate in a workshop for minorities in renewable energy.

A \$52,620 grant to the Energy Foundation of Texas in Houston to examine the "cultural and management practices for (the) Chinese tallow tree as a biomass fuel source."

A \$179,644 grant to the Environmental Action Foundation of Washington, D.C. to develop a "utility clearinghouse."

A \$10,000 grant to Consumer Action Now of New York to hold "Women and Energy Workshops."

A \$43,437 grant to the National Wildlife Federation of Washington, D.C. to hold a "Symposium on the environmental impacts of synthetic fuels production."

A \$315,170 grant to the National League of Cities of Washington, D.C. to work on "municipal energy conservation."

A \$46,856 grant to the National Consumer Research Institute for a conference on "Energy and the Community—The Decade Ahead."

An \$88,000 grant to the National Association of Women "to provide assistance and procurement information to women owned businesses."

A \$10,000 grant to the National Council of Churches to prepare "graphic materials relating to energy emergency planning."

DOE's list of grants continues for many pages, including a \$69,395 grant to make a move called "The Energy Report" and a \$10,000 grant to put together a "bicycle slide show and public service announcements." The list of recipients and their projects stunningly illustrate why America could survive without a Department of Energy.

Throughout these grants and contracts one finds a seemingly endless variety of highly political activist organizations of all shapes and sizes pursuing grassroots, advocacy programs from an almost uniformly leftist point of view.

In most cases these activities and causes are being financed by taxpayers who would not, if asked, support such causes voluntarily. Thus, one finds DOE giving \$20,000 to the Environmental Defense Fund, \$180,000 to the Environmental Action Foundation, \$10,000 to Consumer Action Now, and \$20,000 to Citizen/Labor Energy Coalition.

Nowhere has the propensity of the bureaucracy to fund political and social advocacy organizations of the left been greater than at ACTION, the government's collection of volunteer programs such as VISTA and the Peace Corps.

An examination of ACTION's fiscal 1981 grants reveals, for example, a \$228,000 grant to the Greater Washington Central Labor Council of the AFL-CIO; a \$15,000 grant to the feminist Nine to Five Organization for Women Office Workers; a \$10,000 grant to Organizing for Social Change, Inc. of Providence, R.I.; and a \$5,000 grant to the liberal American Friends Service Committee.

Similarly, the employment and training contracts at the Department of Labor have channeled funds to leftward organizations such as the National Council of La Raza (\$91,000), the Rev. Jesse Jackson's PUSH for Excellence, Inc. (\$2 million), and the National Urban Coalition (\$9,950).

It is not surprising to see America's largest urban lobbying group, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, on the list for \$55,000, nor the liberal think tank, Mathematica Policy Research, receiving \$325,000.

The greening of the special interests is also much in evidence over at the Department of Education where the 1981 grant lists reveal millions of dollars being poured into a Who's Who of liberal to far-left organizations far removed from the political mainstream of American life.

For example, the American Federation of Teachers had its palms greased for \$107,000. The American Bar Association, which lobbies hard for federal programs such as Legal Services to absorb the excess law school graduates, was the recipient of \$1 million in grants.

Other Department of Education recipients include Planned Parenthood, \$110,364; the American Friends Service Committee, \$64,923; the National Organization of Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, \$105,577; the Center for Law and Social Policy, \$257,000; the Feminist Press, \$64,635; the U.S. Student Association, \$55,284; the United Auto Workers, \$7,686.

"The purpose of these groups is to influence legislation and public policies," said a prominent Washington attorney whose career originally began in the public interest movement. He estimated that various so-called public interest and consumer-oriented organizations were receiving at least \$100 million a year in federal grants and contracts during the 1970s.

"Their traditional sources of financing were drying up," he said, "so the only place

left to look (for support) to is the government."

Funds for many of these organizations under the Reagan administration has been measurably curtailed. The days when highly politicized groups such as Midwest Academy, a leftist training institution for community activists, could depend on yearly funding from ACTION or other federal agencies for their counter-culture activities have been ended in many programs.

So-called public participation grants which generously fed the Ralph Nader-type groups have been trimmed at the Federal Trade Commission. And the new crowd at the Legal Services Corporation has tightened the reins on funding of leftist research centers and financing political activities and legislative lobbying.

Moreover, with the elimination of the Great Society's Community Services Administration, the days when the National Urban League could pick up a quick \$125,000 grant or the Food Research Action Center was given \$645,000 to help them lobby for food stamp expansion are fading.

Still, groups and organizations of virtually every stripe continue to receive millions of dollars in funding from almost every department and agency of the government for one project or another.

"Many of the same old groups are still being funded over here," an official with the Department of Education told me. "The spigot hasn't been turned completely off by any means."

"There is still a lot of money in the pipeline," according to one Senate Appropriations Committee aide, "for many of these organizations, and while the budgets may be cut back, the grants and contract game is still being played as aggressively as ever."

Can it be stopped? Yes, if the Reagan administration's Office of Management and Budget is willing to undertake a wall-to-wall housecleaning of every grant, award and contract that has been issued in the current fiscal year.

For openers, an executive order should be issued calling for a review of everyone of them under a stringent criteria of priority and need. Those that do not meet such a test should be summarily terminated.

Congress would also do well to reexamine every appropriation bill for any and all funds used for grants, contracts, and awards to groups and organizations which do not deserve to be supported by America's hard-pressed taxpayers.

Clearly, then, lawmakers who are arguing that budgets have already been "cut to the bone" have never bothered to examine the grant contract lists such as the one at the National Endowment for the Humanities.

An all-too-typical grant from this agency is the \$28,477 to the American Bar Association of Chicago. Its purpose: "To support the planning of a program aimed at increasing the public's understanding of fundamental principles of our legal and judicial system."

Someone should tell the well-heeled legal professionals that they had better fund this one themselves. In case they haven't noticed, our Treasury is deeply in debt. ●

THE NEED FOR PASSAGE OF H.R. 2085 GROWS MORE APPAR- ENT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, I have been placing newspaper articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with a growing national problem—acts of violence directed against religious personnel.

My purpose has been to try and enlist support for passage of my bill H.R. 2085 which would impose stiff new Federal penalties against those persons who commit acts of violence or vandalism against religious persons or facilities.

These crimes against men and women in religious service include rape, assault, and other forms of violence.

The article I wish to place into the RECORD today involves an incident which took place in New York City this past weekend when a 66-year-old Catholic priest was robbed at gunpoint inside his church rectory.

I renew my call for the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice to schedule early action on my bill so we can put an end to these heinous acts of crime.

The article as it appeared in the New York Post on Saturday follows immediately.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 17, 1981]

GUNMAN ROBS PRIEST IN CHURCH RECTORY

(By Philip Messing)

A Catholic priest was robbed at gunpoint inside his church rectory yesterday by a brazen thief who boasted he'd killed three people.

"It was the first time I ever had a gun pointed at me," a gripped and shaken Father John Verona, 66, told The Post.

"It's a sad day . . . You have to experience it to know what it's really like."

The gunman also victimized the priest's blood sister, Maria Gozio, 65 who is visiting the U.S. for the first time from Italy, and Sister Laura Moore, 80.

The thief finally fled with about \$120 and two watches.

It was the most recent in a grim string of attacks directed against the clergy throughout the city.

Yesterday's terrifying ordeal occurred about 1:30 p.m. inside St. Ann's Church, 110 E. 12th St., when Father Verona, a priest for 35 years, was told a man had come by to discuss church business with him.

The man claimed he'd been sent by another priest from a nearby church, so Father Verona allowed him inside.

The visitor was described as a well-dressed black man in his 20s, about 5-foot-11 who was wearing a black topcoat.

After taking a seat in the priest's study he removed a gun from his black attache case.

"I've killed three people! Give me what you have in your pocket," the suspect said.

Father Verona, who was wearing his clerical collar, said he was stunned by the request.

"He spoke kind of softly—I had to ask him to speak up," Father Verona said.

"At first I thought he was going to make a confession . . . but then I realized that wasn't the case and saw what he meant."

Moments earlier, the priest had given his last money—\$11—to an out-of-towner who said he'd been robbed.

The suspect took a watch from the priest and then led him into an adjoining room where Sister Laura Moore and his own sister were staying.

"He then took several dollars from a desk drawer and a watch and \$15 from Sister Laura," Father Verona said.

The cherubic-faced priest said Sister Laura told the bandit: "I think God will punish you for doing this in a church!"

After robbing his second victim, the assailant walked into the adjoining dining room where he stole \$100 in cash and \$15 in Italian money belonging to Father Verona's sister, Maria Gozio, his niece, Wanda Tognola, and her son, Paul, 6.

The thief forced the group into the kitchen area and barricaded the door.●

NORWALK-LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT HONORS 30- YEAR EMPLOYEES

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1982, 10 employees will be honored for 30 years of service to the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District. I am proud to recognize these fine individuals on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Thirty years of service in any profession requires dedication and perseverance. This is especially true in the field of education where one is presented with the awesome responsibility of educating our Nation's youth.

The Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District has one of the finest reputations in its field in the State of California. It is known for having an outstanding educational staff. Each person working in the school and in the district office contributes to the development of the students and the maintenance of the proper environment for learning.

Listed below are the names, school or department in which they are currently assigned, and the present position of all employees in the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District who have 30 years of service. Congratulations and best wishes for many more years of service to the school district and to your community. You have all made a significant contribution to the betterment of our State.

Harold H. Adishian, Nuffer Elementary School, principal; Pauline Brown, Morrison Elementary School, cafeteria manager; Edward V. Crook, La Pluma Elementary

School, principal; Abelardo M. Pena, John Glenn High School, teacher; Howard L. Rainey, business services administrator.

Clinton V. Brown, secondary education assistant superintendent; William M. Campbell, personnel services director; Esther P. Espinoza, Nottingham Elementary School, teacher; Martha D. Pottenger, educational support service, school psychologist; Emmet J. Silver, elementary education assistant superintendent.●

TO WELCOME QUEEN BEATRIX

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents of Dutch descent and for all the people of Michigan, I would like to welcome Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands to the United States. It is a great honor to have Queen Beatrix visit, especially in light of the fact that our two countries have shared more than 200 years of peaceful, cooperative relations.

The Queen's state visit this week signals the beginning, on both sides of the Atlantic, of the Netherlands-American bicentennial celebration. It speaks well for the peoples of both nations that we are celebrating two centuries of peaceful diplomacy. It is rewarding to have such a good friend in the Netherlands.

It will also be a great honor this June when Queen Beatrix again returns to the United States to visit our Fifth District in Michigan. The events surrounding her visit are in the final planning stages. I am looking forward to welcoming Queen Beatrix to Michigan this summer and the people of the Fifth District are equally pleased the Queen is joining us in celebrating the longest reciprocal relationship between any two countries.

The bicentennial is more than just a celebration of friendship, it is a time to remember the contribution Dutch Americans have made to our great Nation. Our Fifth District of Michigan has one of the largest populations of Dutch descent in the country. Their contribution to our west Michigan community has been immeasurable.●

FARRELL HONORS HOMETOWN AUTHOR

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, this week has been declared Library Week. As part of the observances in my hometown of Farrell, Pa., the city and the mayor's fine arts commission are honoring a hometown author who has

built an exciting and distinguished career for herself. I join in paying tribute to Mrs. E. L. Konigsburg—scientist, mother, housewife, and prize-winning author.

Mrs. Konigsburg grew up in Farrell and attended local schools. Her writing stemmed, so she says in a tongue-in-cheek self-interview, from the fact that she never found herself nor her town in any of the books she read—even though the book jackets always promised just that.

To remedy that lack, Mrs. Konigsburg has written 10 books, 2 of which have won the prestigious Newbery Award. Her other writings have also received awards, plus both critical and popular acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, any woman who can cope with modern-day chemistry, a psychologist husband, three children, a highly successful writing career, and a spoiled cocker spaniel named Jason, deserves all the praise we can give her. I wish her and her family many, many years of happiness together. I also hope she will continue to inform and amuse us with more books like "From the Mixed-up Files of Mrs. Basil Frankweiler" and "Jennifer, Hecate, Macbeth, William McKinley, and Me, Elizabeth."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a short but amusing interview of E. L. Konigsburg, conducted by E. L. Konigsburg:

FORTY PERCENT MORE THAN EVERYTHING
YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT E. L. KONIGSBURG

Hello, Mrs. Konigsburg.

Hello.

I thought that I might ask you some questions about your work and your life.

That's perfectly all right with me. I'll tell you everything except my age and weight.

Where do you live?

In Jacksonville, Florida. It's all right, isn't it, if I don't answer in complete sentences?

You're the writer, Mrs. Konigsburg. Let it be on your conscience. Do you have any children?

I have three children. Their names are Paul, Laurie and Ross. They often pose for the illustrations in my books. Laurie was Claudia and Ross was Jamie in "From the Mixed-up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler." Paul was Benjamin Dickinson Carr in "(George)."

Do you have any pets?

We have one blond (spoiled) cocker (spoiled) spaniel (spoiled) named Jason, who thinks more of his stomach than he does of me. Aren't you going to ask if I have a husband?

That was the next question on my list. I wish you'd be more patient, Mrs. Konigsburg. Do you have a husband?

Yes, I do. My husband's name is David, and he is a psychologist.

Where were you born?

New York City, but we moved when I was still an infant. I did most of my growing up in small towns in Pennsylvania. I graduated from Farrell Senior High School in Farrell, Pennsylvania.

Did you always want to be a writer?

No. When I was in college at Carnegie Mellon University, I wanted to be a chemist, so I became one. I worked in a laboratory and went to graduate school at the University of Pittsburgh; then I taught biology and science at a private girls school and had three children and waited until all three were in school before I started writing.

Where do you get the ideas for your books?
Ideas come from observing people and what happens to them and to me. Ideas also come from reading. Do you have a specific book in mind that you would like to ask about?

All right. Where did you get the idea for the book from the mixed-up files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler?

The idea for this book came from three experiences; two of them were reading experiences.

I read in the New York Times that the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City had bought a statue for \$225. At the time of the purchase they did not know who had sculptured it, but they suspected that it had been done by someone famous in the Italian Renaissance; they knew that they had an enormous bargain. (The statue, by the way, is called The Lady with the Primroses; it is not an angel, and it was not sculptured by Michelangelo.)

Shortly after that article appeared in the paper I read a book that told the adventures of some children, who upon being sent by ship from their island home to England, are captured by pirates. In the company of the pirates, the children became piratical themselves; they lost the thin veneer of civilization that they had acquired in their island home.

The third thing that happened was a picnic that our family took while we were vacationing at Yellowstone Park. After buying salami and bread and chocolate milk and paper cups and paper plates and paper napkins and potato chips and pickles, we looked for a place to eat. There were no outdoor tables and chairs, so when we came to a clearing in the woods, I suggested that we all eat there. We all crouched slightly above the ground and began to spread out our meal. Then the complaints began: the chocolate milk was getting warm, and there were ants over everything, and the sun was melting the icing on the cupcakes. This was hardly having to rough it, and yet my small group could think of nothing but the discomfort.

I thought to myself that if my children ever left home, they would never become barbarians even if they were captured by pirates. Civilization was not a veneer to them; it was a crust. They would want at least all the comforts of home plus a few extra dashes of elegance. Where, I wondered, would they ever consider running to if they ever left home? They certainly would never consider any place less elegant than the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Yes, the Metropolitan Museum of Art. All those magnificent beds and all that elegance. And then, I thought, while they were there, perhaps they would discover the secret of a mysterious bargain statute and in doing so, perhaps they could discover a much more important secret, the need to be different—on the inside where it counts.

Are the people in your books real?

Aside from the people in "A Proud Taste for Scarlet and Miniver" and "The Second Mrs. Giaconda," all of whom were real, the people in my other books are made up.

Do you find it fun to write books?

I don't like to be asked that question. Writing books is just as it should be; some-

times it is fun, and sometimes it is simply frustrating. I think that is true of nursing or teaching or doctoring or house building or housewifery. But I know I would rather write.

Do you have any hobbies?

I like to draw and paint and tend my garden. I have a small garden of wild things, plants that I've dug up from the fields around my house. I like to walk along the beach, and I like to think, and I like to read.

Would you describe yourself?

Certainly. I look exactly like the lady in this picture. That's Jason I'm holding. We both have brown eyes.

Would you list the books you have written and the awards they won?

Of course. I have written ten books. Some of my titles are so long that they sound like complete sentences.

"Jennifer, Hecate, Macbeth, William McKinley, and Me, Elizabeth."

1968 Newbery Honor Book.
"From the Mixed-Up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler."

Winner of the Newbery Award.

Winner of the 1970 William Allen White Award.

"About the B'Nai Bagels."

"(George)."

"Altogether, One at a Time."

"A Proud Taste for Scarlet and Miniver."
ALA Notable Book, 1974

National Book Award Nominee

"The Dragon in the Ghetto Caper."

"The Second Mrs. Giaconda."

"Father's Arcane Daughter."

"Throwing Shadows."

Which is your favorite book?

I used to say that I don't have a favorite; now I know that I do. But I won't say which it is. You already know enough about me.

But you said that you would tell everything except your age and weight.

Yes, but I also said that everyone has to have a secret inside. That's one of my internal secrets. My age and weight are outside, visible for all to see.

I guess that's about all I had to ask. I don't know how to end this interview.

Try saying "thank you."

Thank you, Mrs. Konigsburg.

You're welcome, Mrs. Konigsburg.●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in observing April 24, the day of remembrance for the victims of this century's first holocaust, the Armenian genocide, we must call to mind the tragic events of that time. We must remember the past, as the philosopher Santayana said, lest we be condemned to repeat it.

The Armenian people have preserved their national and cultural identity as Christians for more than 2,600 years. Through repeated invasions, foreign rule and purges, the Armenians have retained their own distinctive language and their own sect of Christianity. Indeed, Armenians are rooted in history as the first Christian nation on Earth.

World War I, however, was the beginning of the end for the Armenians. The Turks fought on the German side while the Armenians sympathized with the Allies. On April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian leaders were rounded up. This infamous day marked the beginning of a plan for the systematic extermination of the Armenian people. Approximately 1.5 million victims died. Another million survived only by flight into Russia.

Yet even this unprecedented massacre, bringing death from bullets, bayonets, starvation, and exposure to over a million people, could not extinguish the valiant Armenian people. The personal stories of the survivors tell a tale of courage without precedence in the history of man. One observer relates among the refugees from Ururnish were an old man and his two daughters-in-law, with their six children, three of them babes in arms. They were 8 days on the way, averaging 20 miles daily through the mud. The old man became stuck fast in a pool and at his own request was left there to die. One woman gave birth to a child during the march and an hour afterward was again plodding along with the other refugees. One young woman carried her father for 5 days, when he died. Another woman was found dead by the roadside with her infant, still living, wrapped in her clothes.

Californian Samuel Kadorian, a survivor, watched as his father and all the men of his village aged 10 or older were taken away. When it got dark, they heard the gunshots and saw the muzzle flashes as each of the men and older boys was shot to death one by one. Later, they threw all the children from 5 to 10 years old in a pile, then walked around plunging their bayonets into the pile. By a miracle, Samuel survived to tell the world what happened.

And the world must be told and retold. When asked how he intended to eliminate so many Jews without the world crying out in revenge, Hitler responded: "Look at the Armenians—who remembers them?"

Well, we remember the Armenians, and I feel I can speak for the entire House in urging that the Armenian genocide never be forgotten, and that the loss of the Armenian homeland never be forgotten.●

WHERE YOUR TAX DOLLARS
GO: LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I know that most hard-working people

in this Nation, especially after their recent donations via the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), that they would like to have a job where they are in no way accountable to a boss or to the taxpayers of America, where work division and time is involved.

Well, there is such a job, if you happen to be fortunate enough to land one with the Legal Services Corporation. Although any attorney worth his salt, would not take a job, nor accept a challenge, without any accountability, we do have exceptions. And the money for this, one of the most abusive in the area of leech practitioners, is coming from: you guessed it, the taxpayer.

The Conservative Digest of April 1982 had a small updated version of where some of that Legal Services Corporation money is being spent. Others of my colleagues have had much much more to state on this agency whose spigot should be shut off, and I deem it a service to the taxpayers of America to add fuel to this fire that will eventually put this and other agencies—out of business.

The article, "Legal Services Must Be Stopped," follows:

LEGAL SERVICES MUST BE STOPPED

LEFTIST LAWYERS USE POOR AS POLITICAL PAWNS; REAGAN SAYS PROGRAM MUST END

President Reagan believes the federal Legal Services program is more a boon for legal activists than a program for the poor. In 1981 and again this year, he has asked Congress to cut all funds for the Legal Services Corporation.

However, as a practical matter, considering the multi-million-dollar lobbying slush funds available to Legal Services grantees and their allies, the only way President Reagan can end LSC-financed abuses is by the exercise of his veto. So far he has been unwilling to do this.

WHY LEGAL SERVICES CANNOT BE REFORMED AND MUST BE ENDED

Legal Services gives tax dollars to 325 private legal groups that are accountable only to themselves. The structure of the system makes its participants unaccountable to the taxpayers who foot the bill.

The legal services group decides which cases to pursue, which causes to support, and which targets to attack—using taxpayer dollars.

The board that controls each legal services group is self-perpetuating.

Once a group is funded by Legal Services, the law gives them a presumptive right to more money in future years.

Legal Services attorneys are not required to keep a record of how they use their time and divide their work. Congressional committees and the General Accounting Office have complained about the lack of reliable data on Legal Services management.

There is no economic constraint on salaried Legal Services attorneys. It costs them nothing to sue. Those who are sued by Legal Services must pay for their own representation—for many, an economic impossibility when confronted with the millions spent by Legal Services.

Legal Services lawyers are free to pursue Leftist goals without normal restraint by fee-paying clients.

LEGAL SERVICES PROVIDES NETWORK FOR LEFT-WING ATTORNEYS

The 325 tax-funded private Legal Services groups maintain a loose network, using these funds to plan strategies for social change in America. The Legal Services Corporation helps publish the agencies' magazine, Clearinghouse Review, and also funds 20 "National Support Centers," one of whose primary purposes is to pursue test cases to change U.S. law.

The December, 1979 Clearinghouse Review included an invitation to join a national group, Citizens for Tax Justice. Its members included such Left-dominated groups as the National Consumer Federation of America, the AFL-CIO, and the International Association of Machinists. The group opposes tax relief such as proposed in California's Proposition 13 and in President Reagan's tax program.

In the spring of 1981, local Legal Services groups began their media campaign against the Reagan economic program. An endless stream of articles appeared in local newspapers, all bearing the same message—Reagan will hurt the poor by cutting Legal Services funds.

Part of Legal Services' tactics is the collection of information on individual members of Congress. A preferred procedure was outlined by LSC Research Director Alan Houseman in a December, 1980 memo to the 325 local groups:

"Analyze new members of Congress from your area and review all old members of Congress.

"What is needed is carefully compiled information about all members of Congress.

"This includes attitudes, public statements and prior voting records toward legal services and other social-benefit programs; their supporters and major contributors from within the bar and the general community; possible contacts with their supporters . . ."

SOME RECENT EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONABLE LEGAL SERVICES ACTIONS

Since Legal Services started in the late 1960s, horror stories of the program's abuses have flowed. From suits for sex-change operations and benefits for illegal aliens, to making black English a certified foreign language in the Ann Arbor, Michigan schools, Legal Services has left its scars on common sense in government.

While Reagan has tried to cut its funding and appoint conservatives to the LSC board, the abuses and their results have continued. Here is a sampling from the past year alone:

Prison Riots Result from Legal Services Action. The Governor of Pennsylvania blames Community Legal Services of Philadelphia for helping to cause violence at Graterford Prison in October and November, 1981. Thirty persons were held hostage by a three-time killer, who was returned to the general prison population as a result of a 1975 Legal Services suit.

"Never again should government permit 'cause' groups . . . to place the purported rights of vicious criminals above the safety of law officers," Gov. Richard Thornburgh said. Community Legal Services received \$2,277,972 in federal dollars in 1980 (the most recent figures available).

Legal-Aid Group Sues to Overturn City Referendum. Force Use of Federal Funds. Connecticut Legal Services, Inc., which received \$1,656,488 in 1980, went to court in 1981 to overturn a vote by the people of Manchester, Conn., not to accept federal HUD Community Development money. The

referendum result was 3-1 against taking the HUD grants.

Legal Services won its victory against the city, but the decision was eventually overturned on appeal.

Pittsburgh Legal Services Joins Coalition Favoring Impeachment of President Reagan. Neighborhood Legal Services of Pittsburgh, Pa., which received \$1,504,638 in tax dollars in 1980, recently became a key member of the Fair Budget Coalition, which is organizing a grassroots political campaign against the Reagan budget. It has also called for the impeachment of President Reagan.

Legal Services Continues Fight for Illegal Aliens' "Rights." In the recent past, Legal Services agencies have spent much time and effort representing illegal aliens. At least two cases exist of Legal Services representing Iranians scheduled for deportation during the hostage crisis.

The tax-funded National Center for Immigrant Rights, based in Los Angeles, challenged citizenship requirements for peace officers in California. The Supreme Court overruled their challenge, 5-4, on January 12, 1982.

Tucson's Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc., which received \$851,305 in 1980 from taxpayers, filed suit in January, 1982, to force a local border county to pay for free health care for illegal aliens. The county's health system has been overtaxed with the influx of aliens; it went broke in 1981 and will likely do so again this year.

Tax Dollars Support Iowa Man Indicted for Food-Stamp Fraud. Lester Williams, the unemployed father whose sensationalized New Year's Eve suicide threat caused a national media splash, was indicted January 7, 1982 on 18 counts of food-stamp fraud. Williams has been a client of Polk County Legal Aid Society, which received \$431,992 in tax money in 1980.

Williams' letter of Dec. 30, which was printed in the Des Moines Register, stated that he was going to kill himself the next day because he couldn't find work and his family could use the welfare benefits. The legal-services group helped publicize the letter.●

THE GREAT CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERIGO VESPUCCI

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the occasion to speak at an installation banquet for a member of Italian-American lodges and clubs in the northern Virginia area. The group represented included the George Washington Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, No. 2038; Avanti Lodge (OSIA), Amici D'Italia Lodge (OSIA), Leonardo Da Vinci Lodge (OSIA), and the Italian Heritage Cultural and Fellowship Society Lodge.

During the dinner, there was a discussion of the great contributions of an Italian-American who today remains almost forgotten—Amerigo Vespucci. On March 18 of this year, we

celebrated the 528th anniversary of his birth.

While Christopher Columbus, an Italian, has been celebrated as the discoverer of America, Amerigo Vespucci was a contemporary of Columbus whose name was given to the New World.

Amerigo Vespucci was an Italian merchant and navigator who was born in Florence, Italy, in 1454. After receiving his education, he entered business in Italy and later went to Spain. He may have met Christopher Columbus when Columbus returned from his first expedition. He was active in preparing the ships for the second and third voyages of Columbus. He and Columbus became personally acquainted.

Vespucci made trips to the New World between 1497 and 1504 and was assigned the task of preparing the official map for the newly discovered lands and also of the routes to them. He later left Spain and entered into the service of Portugal. He set sail from Lisbon, Portugal, on May 13, 1501, on the voyage which would be of great historical importance. This voyage is of great significance in the history of geographical discovery, for by it, Vespucci and other scholars became convinced that the lands visited were not a part of Asia, but part of a new world. A document published in 1507, including maps of the newly discovered lands, included a notation, "from Amerigo the discoverer." Gradually the term "America", after Amerigo Vespucci, became widely accepted for the new lands. Amerigo did return to Spain and helped to launch other voyages.

I think it is significant that we pay tribute to a great Italian, Amerigo Vespucci, whose name remains perpetuated in the name of our country.●

LEV MIKHAILOVICH

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, with the holy week recently passed, I feel compelled to draw the attention of Congress to those persons in the Soviet Union who are suffering as a result of their desire to freely worship the Lord. Lev Mikhailovich Forman, a graduate of the Electrotechnical Institute in Leningrad, has been denied employment in his field since he applied for an exit visa in May of 1974. In July of 1976, the Soviet Union denied Lev's emigration visa on the grounds of "secrecy". While Dr. Boris Rubinstein, who held a higher position than Lev within the Institute, was allowed to emigrate, Soviet officials claimed that

Lev "had access to classified information."

Lev's application and subsequent rejection has made him one of the tens of thousands of "refuseniks" now living in the Soviet Union. As you are well aware, these refuseniks are primarily Soviet Jews who have been denied the basic human right to pursue religious freedom. Unfortunately, for Jews in the Soviet Union, the only alternative is to leave their homeland for nations where they and their families can grow and prosper in peace. In 1979, 51,320 Jews were permitted to leave the Soviet Union. By 1981 the number had dwindled to 9,447 and in January of this year a record low of 30 Jews were granted exit visas. At this new rate merely 3,000 Jews will escape Soviet persecution this year.

I am appalled by the Soviet Union's growing, institutional anti-Semitism and redoubled effort to blot out Jewish culture in Russia. While the numbers of freed Jews diminishes each year, the quality of the refuseniks' lives deteriorates. Jews are increasingly blocked from universities and technical institutes. The Soviet Government hounds Jewish study groups, arresting Hebrew teachers and confiscating prayer books. One witness subjected to a KGB raid and seizure says, "They took every scrap of paper with a Hebrew letter on it, and everything that mentioned 'Jew' was immediately regarded as evidence." Jewish activists, cultural leaders, teachers, and mere citizens face the fate of "internal exile" which translates into a life in the Gulag—the Soviet network of prisons, mental institutions, and work camps.

Americans have learned the horrid details of mathematician Anatoly Shcharansky's KGB harassment and imprisonment. His crime? He, too, applied for an exit visa. His present status? He sits in Christopol Prison and is fed every other day. According to the diligent reports of the Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry based in this country, he was last visited by his mother, Ida Milgrom, in 1979. She states that her son looked "like a prisoner from Auschwitz." And Shcharansky is not alone. This week we are scheduled to discuss the status of Benedict Scott, Mart Niklus, Dr. Semyon Gluzman and his family, and Yuli Kosharavsky and his family. In each instance Congress will implore the Soviet Union to grant some degree of human rights to these individuals.

Our Constitution has as its foundation the belief that each individual "is endowed with certain inalienable rights" upon which the Government, as defender of the common welfare, cannot encroach. In a world as interdependent as ours, it seems hypocritical for us to ignore the plight of those citizens of other nations whose sole

crime is the pursuit of those liberties among which we have numbered the right to be free from Government violations of one's personal safety and integrity; the undeniable right to the fulfillment of such vital needs as food, shelter, health care, and education; and, finally, the right to enjoy civil and political liberties.

Lev Forman is only one of many Soviet Jews who has been denied those guarantees we so often take for granted here at home. Lev's family has been harassed. His father, a cancer patient, was jailed. Lev has served sporadic jail terms. He faces a hollow existence and eventual imprisonment is a near certainty if he cannot emigrate.

The members of this body must continue to take up the cause for individual refuseniks and draw national attention to their martyrdom. Having recently celebrated the feast of the Passover and the joy and promise of Easter this past week, I am moved to pray for Lev, and hope that these words, before Congress, can bring him closer to the freedom that grants me the ability to stand here and address you today.●

REMEMBER THE HOLOCAUST

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was 39 years ago this April that the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto wrote an unforgettable chapter in the record of heroism. Poorly armed, hungry, ill-clothed, they hurled themselves on the Nazi invaders who had come to clean out the remnants of the ghetto. The Nazis were liquidating the ghetto; they intended to liquidate the surviving residents in the death camps of Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Belsen.

The defenders of the ghetto did not win, but they showed the world that free men and women would not go to their deaths without protest, without fighting for their dignity as human beings.

We are remembering the Holocaust, that terrible event of the 20th century when an entire race—men, women, and children—were condemned to death solely because they were Jewish. Surely this was the moment that we knew a particularly virulent infection was plaguing mankind in this century. For all our knowledge and our technology this was not going to be a century of enlightenment.

Rather, the beast in man was loose. I confess that I find it very hard to confront the reality of the Holocaust. Here was an entire system of well-organized camps, smoothly running, with its own transportation network,

all set up solely for the purpose of murder.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, murder. That was what Auschwitz and the other camps were set up for—murder. This was the kingdom of death. Human beings came alive to these camps and were killed—killed in enormous numbers.

Six million men, women, and children are gone, many of them unknown, just people whose whereabouts could not be established at the end of the Second World War. The centuries old Jewish culture and society that existed between the Baltic and Black Seas had practically ceased to exist, the world of the villages and the urban centers, the world we know through the stories of Sholom Aleicham.

This was the victory Adolf Hitler won. He had destroyed a good part of European Jewry. He had left parts of Europe free of Jews. The Nazi philosophy had gained this triumph.

What can we do for those who died in the Holocaust? Obviously, we cannot bring them back from their graves. But we can remember. We can remember that these people, with their hopes and dreams and plans, were swept away in a cataclysm not of their making. They committed no crime; rather, they died for being the wrong race and the wrong religion.

This must never be allowed to happen again.

Of course, we are used to horror now, the horror of this century, and the years since the Second World War. Ibos have been massacred, Cambodians have been massacred, Idi Amin showed us the spirit of Hitler is not dead. Stalin arranged the deportation of millions of Russian and non-Russian nationals; at the end of his life, he had his own designs against the Jews. We may no longer be capable of horror or shock, after all those millions of victims—too many victims, just a row of statistics, it seems too many.

Let us not abandon our common humanity, Mr. Speaker. Let us never get to the point where we are not shocked, not horrified, by wanton murder. Let us assert at all times the sacredness of life, all life.

Every life is a life worth living. That statement was made by a survivor of the death camps. Let that be the eternal tribute to those who died in the Holocaust. ●

VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE OF INCOME AND LIABILITIES

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, each year at about this time I make

a voluntary disclosure of income, taxes, assets, and liabilities.

For 1981 I paid a total of \$25,231.49 in taxes, including \$21,189.14 income taxes, and \$4,042.35 property and sales taxes.

My chief source of taxable income was \$60,662.50 salary as Congressman. Other income included: An annuity of \$1,039.74 and dividends of \$938.35 from the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association (TIAA); \$302.44 from the college retirement equities fund (CREF); \$568.16 net rents from my farm and townhouse both located in Harford County; \$100 from the Sunpapers for an article; \$10.92 interest from savings.

I want to emphasize that I do not benefit in any way from the tax break for living expenses in Washington that Members of Congress voted last year, because I live in my district and commute to Washington every day. In fact, I opposed the measure and have introduced a bill to repeal those special deductions.

Following my longstanding policy, no gifts from constituents or interest groups, however small or in whatever form—even flowers or fruit—were accepted by me or my staff.

As of April 20, 1982, real property consisted of my home in Ruxton purchased in 1946 for \$32,000; a 112-acre farm in Harford County bought in 1965 for \$118,000; and a townhouse in Harford County bought in late 1979 for \$47,900. My farm and Ruxton home are free of debt. My mortgage debt for the townhouse—Yorkridge Federal Savings and Loan Association—is \$37,967.11.

In nearly 20 years as a Congressman, I have contributed a total of \$64,013.04 to the Federal retirement system—which cannot be withdrawn in cash. Estimated capital value to my Teachers Insurance Annuity Association policies—not convertible into cash—was about \$15,000.

Other assets as of April 20, 1982, include a 1980 Regal Buick, valued at \$5,400; a 1977 Volare Plymouth station wagon, valued at \$2,200; 86 shares in the T. Rowe Price Prime Reserve money market accounts valued at \$1,000; \$12,000 in a savings account; home rugs and furnishings; my wife's jewelry—nearly all inherited; clothing; and a checking account sufficient to pay current bills. ●

BILL INTRODUCED TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE DEEP SEABED HARD MINERALS RESOURCES ACT

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BREAU, and Mr. ZABLOCKI in introducing a bill to extend the authorization of the Deep Seabed Hard Minerals Resources Act for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985. This landmark legislation was originally enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1980 to establish and interim procedure for the orderly development of the hard mineral resources in the deep seabed pending adoption of an acceptable international law of the sea agreement. Responsibility for implementing the act lies with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in the Department of Commerce.

Since enactment of the legislation, NOAA has proceeded to fulfill in a timely fashion its responsibilities under titles I and II of the act by developing a regulatory framework for the mining of the seabed by U.S. citizens and by laying the groundwork for a smooth transition to an international agreement. In particular, NOAA has promulgated final regulations for exploration licenses, issued a supporting final environmental impact statement, and published a technical guidance document to assist license applicants. NOAA has also, in conjunction with the Department of State, engaged in extensive negotiations with other nations that have domestic legislation authorizing deep seabed mining for the purposes of concluding an agreement with them respecting each other's claims.

While the basic legal framework for regulating seabed mining exploration is now in place, several major tasks for developing the program remain. Since January 1982, NOAA has received numerous applications for exploration licenses which will require initial processing, resolution of overlapping claims among applicants, and continual monitoring of the activities undertaken pursuant to the licenses. Each license will require the preparation of a site-specific environmental impact statement which will, in turn, entail the development by NOAA of extensive data bases to assess potential impacts. The onsite environmental monitoring and research needed to generate such data will require increased investments of time and resources. Finally, as the U.S. industry moves closer to commercial recovery of deep

seabed nodules, proper regulatory support for permitting commercial recovery will play a crucial role in insuring U.S. leadership in the development of the industry. Such regulatory support will require additional information on the economic, technological, and environmental impacts of commercial mining operations.

The bill which I have introduced today with my colleagues seeks to provide NOAA with the funds that will be necessary for it to fulfill these tasks. The bill incorporates the administration's funding request for fiscal year 1983 of \$1,469,000, and would authorize funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 of \$2,150,000 and \$2,600,000, respectively. Omitted from these funding requests are the resources for the ship support services and ship time that will be required. While such vessel related funding is available elsewhere in the NOAA budget, it is fully expected that the necessary vessel support for the deep seabed mining program will be forthcoming.

I urge my colleagues to support this landmark program and the necessary extension of authorizations that it will require when the bill is considered by the full House of Representatives.●

U.S. CITIZEN DETAINED IN SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering several important pieces of legislation that deal with human rights violations by the Soviet Union. Since the signing of the Helsinki accords in 1975, the Soviet Union has shown callous disregard for the rights of the subjugated peoples of the Baltic States and the Ukraine.

A prime example of the Soviets disregard of freedom and liberty is in the case of Benedict Scott (Vytautas Skuodis). Mr. Scott was born in my hometown of Chicago in 1929. In 1930 his parents of Lithuanian descent, emigrated from the United States back to their newly independent homeland of Lithuania. Less than 1 year later the Soviets illegally invaded and occupied Lithuania. Mr. Scott is a U.S. citizen by birth and is being illegally detained in a Soviet prison camp.

House Resolution 200, which is before us today will express the sense of the Congress with respect to the unjust imprisonment of Benedict Scott a citizen of the United States. This resolution would urge the President to take every appropriate action to secure the release of this American citizen and the emigration of Mr. Scott and his family from the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet Government is serious about détente and a reduction in tensions with our country, they must first demonstrate a commitment for human rights as enunciated in the Helsinki accords. Only then will their pronouncements of détente and arms control with the West be taken seriously.●

A MESSAGE FOR PRESIDENT REAGAN

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I seen a 10-paragraph message that does such an excellent treatise on not only the ills that face this Nation, but offering concise and clear advice on how to rectify those ills.

Such a message was contained in "Officer Review" of March 1982, by the commander-in-chief of the Military Order of the World Wars. That commander-in-chief, Col. Jack N. Rogers, U.S. Army Reserve (retired), hoped he could convey such a message personally to President Reagan.

I have no idea as to what the President reads these days, but I think it a matter of the highest importance to at least share Colonel Rogers' words with my colleagues, in the vain hope that one of them just might convey them to President Reagan. Colonel Rogers' comments on behalf of the Military Order of the World Wars follow:

CINC's COMMENTS

"Mister President, we believe—"

If I could meet with President Reagan, and tell him some of the issues about which the companions of our Order are concerned, I would say these things to him:

"Mister President, your companions in the MOWW are generally well pleased with the changes in policy your administration has made. We are most seriously concerned that our national security is in substantial danger, for many reasons, and we would like to see you take the following actions.

We believe that to gain the support of the public for the great costs of a sound national defense, you should tell the people the truth about the real nature of our conflict with the Communists. The mortal danger to our free world is well documented, but the public will never lose its complacency until you, as our leader, tell us the whole truth about what the Communists are, their record of terror, subversion and oppression, their true strength and what they intend for us. Similar straightforward statements are needed about the incredible extent and cost of crime to our society. We believe that only you, as President of The United States, can convincingly present these facts to the people.

When this has been done, we believe the Congress will fully support the great increases in military preparedness and the improvements in our internal security that are

clearly necessary to insure the protection of our freedom.

We believe that you should create a limited national program of education, training, and even indoctrination, of the youth of our nation in a few simple principles of good citizenship. This program should be universal, begin at the first grade level and be limited to those ideals of personal responsibility that are accepted by all our people, to include respect for the personal rights and property of all people, respect for the law, and respect for our nation, its free institutions, and the sacrifices that made them available to us.

We believe you should lead the nations of the Western Hemisphere to a unified stand against Communist aggression and subversion through a mutual security pact, supporting the national sovereignty and freedom of every member nation.

We believe that there must be an immediate and lasting solution to the illegal alien problem, which we see as a threat to our free political institutions and our economic security. We do not need an alien subculture with its roots in violation of our laws.

We believe that you should stress in economic policy making the concept that quality productivity is the key to economic strength.

We believe that if waste and cheating are eliminated, an adequate and fair tax program can and should be adopted to put our government on a pay-as-you-go basis. We will pay our fair share, as will all the people if they understand the needs and are satisfied that the program is a fair one. If our government is thereby taken out of competition with private financing, we believe the interest rates will fall and the whole economy of the nation will be greatly stimulated.

Finally, we thank you for listening to us and we commend and thank you for the great work you are doing, for the good people you have brought into our government, for your kindness, good humor, sound judgment and courage, and we ask God to protect you and guide you in the dangerous times that lie ahead of us."●

THE B-1 "PEACEMAKER"

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the former distinguished minority leader, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, in a major speech before the floor of the House, has offered us his reflections regarding the critical issue of the defense of our Nation. While a number of his points are well taken, others are sure to provoke vigorous debate and none more so than his views on the B-1 bomber or, as I prefer to call it, the B-1 "Peacemaker" because that is its primary function—to act as a deterrent and so keep the peace.

Mr. Rhodes recommends that the B-1 be scrapped as a budget savings measure in favor of a Stealth bomber. He then goes on to candidly admit that "not building the B-1 may result

in a defense gap in the middle and late eighties. Personally, I doubt it but I will take a chance on that."

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental difference between the former minority leader and myself is that he is willing to accept that dangerous defense gap whereas I, in good conscience, cannot. Let me briefly go into the reasons why I cannot support my distinguished colleague.

While Mr. RHODES is content to wait for the development of the Stealth bomber, it is a well known fact that the Soviet Union already has its version of the B-1, namely, the Backfire bomber which is capable of reaching the United States. Placed in service in the mid-1970's, the Backfire is a twin-engine, swing-wing, turbofan-powered bomber capable of carrying free-fall bombs and air-to-surface missiles. Over 70 Backfires are presently deployed with long range aviation with a like number assigned to Soviet naval aviation. The Backfire is a versatile, multi-purpose aircraft capable of performing nuclear strikes, conventional attacks, anti-ship and reconnaissance missions and is currently being produced at the rate of about 2½ aircraft a month or 30 a year. In short, the Soviet Union considers it imperative to have a sophisticated bomber now.

As my distinguished colleague knows from his years on the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, two legs of our defensive strategic triad are dangerously weak. Our land-based missiles must be significantly strengthened to be able to sustain a Soviet first-strike while the air-breathing leg of the triad—our B-52 bombers—are ancient relics from the early 1950's with the pilots, in many instances, younger than the aircraft they fly. Time has taken its toll on the B-52's. As recently as October 30 of last year, 1981, a member of the Air Force Reserve, 1st Lt. Navigator Kendall Wallace, crashed in a B-52 D model 10 miles from LaJolla, Calif. Can we in good conscience jeopardize the lives of our young men with inferior, obsolescent aircraft? A fleet of slow, aging subsonic aircraft is hardly a match for the sophisticated Backfire particularly when you consider that as they near Soviet airspace, our B-52's would face the world's most impressive air defense, including thousands of supersonic surface-to-air missiles and fighters.

Mr. Speaker, as I have endeavored to point out on numerous occasions, the B-1 aircraft—the first squadron of which is expected to be operational in 1986—is acknowledged by the majority of aviation experts to be the best bomber ever developed by man. As a former U.S. Air Force fighter pilot and as one who has personally piloted the B-1, I can attest to the sophistication, the versatility, and the aerodynamic superiority of this remarkable aircraft.

The B-1 is not a prisoner of a pre-determined, computerized course. It can take swift, evasive action. It can dodge and weave and avoid enemy weapons. It can be recalled if launched while the United States is under possible, but not confirmed, surprise Soviet nuclear attack. The flexible B-1, armed with cruise missiles, can respond to an infinite variety of battle conditions in a fashion that even the most sophisticated "drone" aircraft or missile never could. We simply cannot rely on missiles alone—the Soviets do not.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur once wrote:

The history of failure in war can be summed up in two words: too late. Too late in comprehending the deadly purposes of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to resubmit my remarks of November 18, 1981, regarding the B-1 for the RECORD.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 18, 1981]

RESUBMITTED REMARKS OF ROBERT K. DORNAN OF CALIFORNIA, ON THE B-1 "PEACEMAKER"

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues here today in support of President Reagan's efforts to restore funding for the B-1 bomber project which President Carter had terminated. Now we have a President more committed to maintaining the delicate strategic balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. In pursuit of that balance, President Reagan has announced his intention to build the long-delayed B-1 bomber. This aircraft is acknowledged by the majority of aviation experts to be the best bomber ever developed by man. It is capable of penetrating Soviet air space undetected and may continue to have that ability until the 1990's or later. Only after the Soviets spend massive funds on improved radar systems will they be even able to detect the B-1.

The citizens of my 27th Congressional District can be particularly proud of the B-1 bomber project; much of the research/development and manufacture is the work of local citizens. The Reagan decision to recommend funding for the construction of the B-1 is based upon some logically accepted assumptions. The United States must depend heavily on bombers—and sea-based forces—while we take steps to strengthen our land-based missiles. We cannot afford the luxury to wait for the Stealth bomber, which presently exists only on paper. There are currently technical uncertainties about the Stealth bomber. It is expected that these uncertainties will be resolved during development and the advanced technology bomber will be a very effective aircraft when ultimately deployed. Without the B-1, there would be pressures to accelerate the Stealth bomber, which would increase program risks and possibly result in a less capable aircraft being deployed. Building two bombers will stimulate competition and give the Defense Department the flexibility to adjust bomber production in accordance with any changes in estimates of the cost and effectiveness of the two aircraft, as well as any changes in the Soviet military capabilities.

President Reagan has proposed building 100 of the variant bombers. The term variant is used because research and development has continued on the B-1 since the Carter cancellation. Innovations and efficiencies developed in the 5 years since its cancellation will be incorporated in the new variant model. The first B-1 squadron is expected to be operational in 1986.

Mr. John W. R. Taylor, editor of *Janes All the World's Aircraft*, is universally recognized as one of the foremost experts on every type of military and civilian aircraft. Mr. Taylor warns,

"It is therefore vital for all people to understand that the fragile co-existence maintained for generations by balanced East-West military power is being allowed to slip inch by inch from our grasp."

When Mr. Taylor was asked about his thoughts on the opposition that has been raised to the B-1, he replied:

"Most of that has been due to the high cost. But really, I do not think that the cost is the main consideration. It is a question of what it does for you. Does it keep you alive? If there is anything else that will do the job less expensively, by all means build it. But, in this case, there just isn't anything else."

The decision to build the B-1 is a clear move away from the previous administration's policy of unilateral arms restraint. The Reagan administration wants to be sure that any weapons system forgone by the U.S. Government is reciprocated by the Soviet Union. The new policy direction will increase the Soviet incentive to seriously discuss arms limitation agreements. In turn, assisting our Nation in achieving its most important foreign policy goals: Preservation of peace and valid arms limitation agreements with verifiable provisions in any treaty that is agreed upon.

The B-1 bomber will have advantages that no other leg of our triad of strategic nuclear forces possesses. Some of these are:

Bombers are the only element that can be launched prior to a decision to employ these weapons, and permits a trained crew to take actions and accept responsibilities that cannot be anticipated or preprogrammed in missile systems.

Weapons-carrying bombers can be launched to insure their survivability, or to signal national resolve during times of crisis with the confidence that the crew can be redirected or recalled as the situation develops. Bombers can be put on increased ground alert, dispersed to remote airfields, flown on airborne alert, or dispatched to trouble spots throughout the world without a final commitment to use their weapons. In a time when the availability of foreign bases and ports is uncertain, the B-1 will provide the quickest, and in some cases probably the only, means to mount a rapid show of force.

Bombers provide the only capability to engage unanticipated or mobile targets by using the crew and aircraft sensors to determine target location at the times of delivery.

In assisting maritime roles, bombers have the inherent capability to provide an important supplement to U.S. Naval Forces. They can provide collateral maritime support in long range sea surveillance and interdiction, mine laying and, potentially, in antisubmarine warfare.

As a reusable strategic weapons system, bombers have the capability to accurately deliver large nuclear or conventional payloads throughout the course of the conflict, regardless of the level.

The B-1 is going to enter into the defense of our Nation's borders much later than it could have or should have. It will nevertheless play a vital role on our strategic defense until the year 2000, and perhaps beyond. First as a penetrating bomber, later as a bomber capable of standing off the coast of an adversary nation and launching cruise missiles. Its manufacture sends a strong signal to the Soviets that we are as serious about our defense as we are about pursuing arms agreements.

And one more item before I close. I will be circulating a letter to colleagues which will be sent to the President asking him to appoint the Nation's No. 1 "junkyard dog" and a bona fide "cheap hawk" as the project manager for the B-1 project. I, of course refer to A. Ernest Fitzgerald who was removed some 10 years ago from his position of authority in the C-5A cargo plane project because he "committed a truth" with respect to the C-5A cost overruns in testimony before a congressional committee. I think that the appointment of Mr. Fitzgerald will further add credibility to the President's efforts to build up the defenses of the United States without at the same time breaking the national treasury.●

**CITY OF NORWALK TO HONOR
JOHN ZIMMERMAN, JR.**

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, It is my pleasure to stand before my colleagues in the House and pay tribute to John Zimmerman, Jr. John has been a friend and associate for many years. On April 29, he will be honored at a dinner that will mark his retirement from the city council in Norwalk, Calif. Very few individuals can match John's record of public service.

John Zimmerman is a charter member of the Norwalk City Council serving continuously since 1957. During his 25 years on the council, he was selected four times by his peers to serve as mayor and is presently mayor pro tempore.

A Norwalk resident since 1947, John and his lovely wife, Eleanor, have two sons, Guy and Gary. His career in business, community service, and government is unparalleled. For the past 23 years John has been the owner and operator of the Norwalk Travel Center.

He is a member of the First United Methodist Church, the Kiwanis Club toastmaster, and has been active in Scouting. John received the Order of Merit and Silver Beaver Scouting Awards.

Besides serving on the city council, John is a member of the League of California Cities Transportation and Freeways Committee, member of the Los Angeles County Library Commission, representative of the I-105 Freeway Committee, member of the Los Angeles County Sanitation District

and a past president of the Structural Pest Control Board for the State of California. John also assisted in forming the Norwalk sister city affiliation with Hermisillo, Sonora, Mexico, and received a national award for his work in the program.

John Zimmerman is Norwalk, Calif. It is through his effort and that of his colleagues on the council that the city has the outstanding reputation it does today. John Zimmerman is a true public servant and the residents of Norwalk owe him great debt and a big thank you. I echo their sentiments.●

ASSAULTS ON THE FREEZE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, so far more than 160 members have signed on to the Conte-Markey resolution calling on the United States and the Soviet Union to freeze their nuclear arsenals and then to begin reductions. The resolution is in response to a growing movement across the country calling for a halt to the nuclear arms race.

Not only has the Reagan administration turned its back on this movement, it has pulled out all the stops to try to sink our resolution. But the administration has been unable to defuse this resolution and the movement because the movement's message is a common-sense one that says the arms race must be stopped. I commend to my colleagues a recent article by Paul C. Warnke that gives a good analysis of the White House assault on the resolution.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 3, 1982]

**WE SHOULD HEED CALL FOR NUCLEAR ARMS
FREEZE**

(By Paul C. Warnke)

President Reagan and his colleagues have tried to dismiss and discredit calls for a nuclear arms freeze. But the criticisms aren't convincing and the issue won't go away.

Some opponents say a freeze would reward the Soviets for their massive missile buildup and leave us at a continuing strategic nuclear disadvantage. These arguments focus just on the intermediate-range nuclear forces in the European theater, now the subject of negotiations in Geneva; the Soviets have about 300 SS-20 missiles there, while NATO has nothing comparable.

But there is no Soviet advantage in overall strategic balance.

We have the edge in the most significant respects, such as survivability. If an immediate freeze could miraculously be achieved, the existing situation of mutual deterrence would be preserved. Neither side could possibly anticipate profiting from the initiation of a nuclear war. The country attacked would retain the capability to inflict comparable devastation on its attacker.

Opponents of a freeze claim it isn't good enough, and that what we want and need

are substantial reductions. But if the goal is fewer nuclear weapons on both sides, that goal can't be reached by adding new weapons as old ones are eliminated. And the call for a freeze is a call for a ban on additional weapons, not also a demand that the two nuclear superpowers maintain forever their present grossly excessive levels.

A nuclear weapons freeze is not, of course, the complete answer. But, at a minimum it would mean that the United States and the Soviet Union would not continue to add to the problem and to the peril. A freeze is the necessary partner of reductions.

Implementation of a freeze could logically begin with the prompt completion of the comprehensive test ban treaty that has been under negotiation with the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom since mid-1977. All that stands in the way now of an agreed on total ban on nuclear explosions is the necessary political will. Such a comprehensive test ban would be a major step in controlling nuclear arms and discouraging the proliferation of new nuclear-weapons states.

The attempt to equate the freeze proposals with President Leonid I. Brezhnev's recent initiative is without merit. His announcement is limited to intermediate-range missiles and is not a freeze at all, but simply a statement that any additional SS-20s will be deployed on their mobile launchers in the non-European part of the Soviet Union.

A more sophisticated and rational argument against an instant nuclear freeze is that some of the programs we are currently undertaking would in fact increase our deterrent strength and enhance its survivability—without adding a destabilizing counterforce threat against the Soviet deterrent.

But there is, I am quite confident, no risk that we will arrive at a negotiated, bilateral, verifiable freeze too soon. The deployment of air-launched cruise missiles on our strategic-bomber force and the addition of the longer-range Trident I submarine-launched ballistic missile are too far along to be cut off. And an exception could be made for them if necessary.

The freeze resolution proposed last month in Congress specifically provides that the United States and the Soviet Union will decide "when and how" to achieve a freeze. It might well be agreed also that the Soviets can move a larger share of their allowed limit of strategic nuclear-delivery vehicles to their ballistic-missile submarine force, with compensating cuts in the more destabilizing land-based launchers of intercontinental missiles with multiple warheads.

The nuclear weapons freeze proposals do not purport to write the detailed text of a treaty. They reflect the deep concern of the American public, as the European anti-nuclear weapon movement reflects the deep concern there about the growing danger of nuclear war.

What possibly can be wrong with heeding the call, stopping the arms race and proceeding with substantial reductions?

I haven't yet heard a good answer. I don't think there is one.●

A TRIBUTE TO C. WILLIAM
HOFMANN, JR.

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a civic leader in my district of exceptional dedication and accomplishment.

Mr. C. William Hofmann, Jr., who was, until December 31, 1981, the mayor of Ringwood Borough, was honored by his friends and fellow community leaders on Saturday, April 3, 1982, at a testimonial dinner. I would like to join in the praise of Mr. Hofmann, who left his public office with a distinctive record of achievement and widespread respect for his fairness and hard work.

A member of the Ringwood Board of Education from 1971 to 1975, he went on to become a member of the Ringwood Borough Council from 1976 to 1978. His knowledge of area politics, in addition to his untiring efforts on behalf of the people of his borough, led to his election as mayor of Ringwood in 1979, a post which he held until this past December.

I highly commend C. William Hofmann for the great contribution he has made to both Bergen County and the State of New Jersey. It is important to recognize Americans who are willing to devote so much of themselves to the betterment of their community, and Mr. Hofmann exemplifies this virtue.

On behalf of his family and friends and community, I would like to say that we are all grateful for the dedication and compassion for his fellow man that William Hofmann has demonstrated in so many ways throughout his life. I wish him and his family the best of health and happiness in the years ahead.●

TAY-SACHS MONTH IN
PHILADELPHIA

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow colleagues in Congress, as well as to the American public that May 1982 will mark Tay-Sachs Month in Philadelphia.

Tay-Sachs is a hereditary disease which is caused by an enzyme deficiency. Although there is no cure for the disease it can be prevented. A single blood test can identify carriers and with professional genetic counseling,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

even high-risk couples can have healthy children. Because this disease occurs more often in Jewish infants, this simple blood test is particularly important for Jewish adults.

The marking of May as Tay-Sachs Month will effectively serve to bring increased awareness to this life-threatening disease. Mr. Speaker, I believe that through this increased awareness and the efforts of such groups as the National Tay-Sachs and Allied Diseases Associations, significant advances in research and prevention can be made. I hope that everyone will join in the efforts to combat this disorder.

Finally, I would like to share with my colleagues the proclamation made by William J. Green, mayor of the city of Philadelphia, with regards to Tay-Sachs Month.

PROCLAMATION FOR TAY-SACHS MONTH

Whereas, Tay-Sachs disease is a hereditary disorder in which the nerve and brain cells of a child, causing loss of physical skills, sight, the ability to eat, and finally death; and

Whereas, although any child might be afflicted, Tay-Sachs disease occurs more frequently in Jewish infants than in other children, so it is imperative that all Jewish adults take a simple blood test to learn if they are carriers of the Tay-Sachs gene; and

Whereas, the Delaware Valley Chapters of the National Tay-Sachs and Allied Diseases Association were founded in Philadelphia in 1969 with three goals—to educate the community, to assist families of afflicted children, and to support research; and

Whereas, among the accomplishments of the Delaware Valley Chapters are the organization and funding of the Tay-Sachs prevention program of the Thomas Jefferson University; an open clinic at Jefferson University which makes testing available throughout the year; and the Baer Tay-Sachs Mobile Testing unit which is available to any organization or community which wishes to sponsor a testing;

Now, therefore, I, William J. Green, Mayor of the City of Philadelphia, do hereby proclaim the month of May, 1982 as Tay-Sachs Month in Philadelphia and do urge all Philadelphians to generously support the fund raising efforts of the National Tay-Sachs and Allied Diseases Association, and further urge members of the Jewish community to take advantage of the testing program for the future health and long life of their children.●

EL SALVADOR: WINNING
THROUGH NEGOTIATION

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, Latin American specialist Robert Pastor of the Brookings Institution has written a very good article for the March 17 New Republic in which he argues that we can only achieve our objectives in El Salvador by placing conditions on our aid, working for a negotiated set-

tlement, and placing limits on our involvement in that country. By resisting congressional attempts to include these principles in U.S. policy, Pastor points out, the President risks having his flexibility further curtailed by Congress in the future—and makes it more likely that the radical left or extreme right will seize power. I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to this article:

WINNING THROUGH NEGOTIATION

(By Robert Pastor)

The United States is becoming so worried about "another Vietnam" in El Salvador that it is about to repeat an historical error of a quite different sort—the error that led to foreign policy failures in Cyprus and in Angola and on emigration from the Soviet Union and on human rights in the mid-1970s. In each instance, Congress sent the executive branch a foreign policy signal; in each instance, that signal was ignored. The result, predictably, was that every time the executive went back to Congress with additional requests, Congress shortened the leash, limiting the flexibility necessary for good diplomacy. In the end there was no flexibility, and no U.S. interest was served. Then the executive blamed Congress—for alienating Turkey, for "losing" Angola, for reducing emigration from the Soviet Union, for antagonizing friends.

We seem to be headed in the same self-defeating direction in El Salvador. Congress is sending a foreign policy signal to the executive, and the executive doesn't appear to be listening. Last December, Congress amended the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981 to instruct the President to withhold aid to the government of El Salvador unless that government "is making a concerted and significant effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights," is gaining control over its security forces, is carrying out its reforms, and is demonstrating a "good faith effort to begin discussions with all major political factions in El Salvador." In the same law, Congress wrote that economic and military aid from the United States "should be used to encourage" these and other specific objectives, including a complete investigation of the deaths of the American religious workers.

Congress left the President some discretion on how to implement these provisions. Mr. Reagan took every bit of it and more; indeed, he pursued a different policy entirely. Instead of using the aid to pursue the seven objectives in the law, he is using it to pursue one: the defeat of the guerrillas. Instead of encouraging the Salvadoran government to make a good faith effort to open discussions with the left, he has supported the insistence by José Napoleón Duarte's government on a wholly disingenuous precondition to discussions: that the left lay down its arms.

So the Reagan Administration should not be surprised if, in the next round of requests for aid, Congress limits the discretion and shortens the leash. We can then expect, before too long, to hear Secretary of State Alexander Haig complain that Congress is tying his hands, that those military options he is forever "ruling neither out nor in" are in fact ruled out. And then, when El Salvador goes the way of Cuba, the Reagan Administration will blame Congress. Congress

will blame the Administration. And the country will blame them both.

There is a better way. Although Congress is far from unified, one can identify the seeds of an emerging policy toward El Salvador in the 1981 law and in the view of those who pressed for the amendment, including Representatives Michael Barnes, Stephen Solarz, and Jonathan Bingham, and Senators Paul Tsongas and Christopher Dodd. In its February 17 editorial, "Friendly Fire," The New Republic outlined a policy that is quite consistent with the Congressional initiative. TNR shares Congress's uncertainty about whether such a policy would work. But these seeds, properly tended, are the basis for a successful U.S. strategy.

The Administration believes that there is one war in El Salvador—against the Communists—and that the U.S. should do all that is necessary to win it. Congress believes that there's a second war—against the repression by the right and the security forces—and that unless the Salvadoran government succeeds in winning this war, it won't win the one against the left. Congress is correct. The three seeds of the Congressional strategy are conditionality, negotiations, and limits. Here is a look at each—along with the Administration's objections, and a suggestion of what might happen if the Administration stopped objecting to these ideas and started implementing them.

(1) *Conditionality.* Strict conditionality would mean a credible threat to reduce aid if concerns on human rights, etc., are not met. The Administration objects to this because it does not want to desert or undermine a friend in a moment of crisis. In addition, the Administration accepts the argument of El Salvador's military high command that to insist on disciplining the security forces is to risk dividing and weakening them. The result is that the Administration is likely to continue to urge the military to clean up its act and the government to implement the reforms, but it will never threaten or reduce aid if progress is not evident in these areas.

The strategy of conditionality, like the strategy of nonviolence, cannot work if a government is implacable or without moral scruples; it wouldn't work, for example, in Guatemala or the Soviet Union. But it can work—indeed, has worked—in El Salvador, because both the civilian leadership (Duarte) and the military leadership (Defense Minister José García and Junta member Jaime Abdul Gutiérrez) understand that reform helps the government and repression hurts it. Duarte can't control the repression because the Reagan Administration has denied him the leverage necessary to command the respect of the military. García and Gutiérrez won't do it on their own because they are too busy fighting the war, and because they don't want to do anything that could risk demoralizing part of the military and perhaps even stimulating the emergence of new rightist paramilitary forces which could threaten their control. They will take such risks only if they are informed that they will risk even more—all U.S. and international support—if they don't. But as long as Mr. Haig is saying "we will do whatever is necessary" to defeat the left in El Salvador, he is giving the military a blank check and telling the government not to take the risk of disciplining its security forces.

García and Gutiérrez need to be pushed to do what they know they must do but won't do on their own. Let me cite some cases to show that a strategy of conditionality could work.

Barely two months after overthrowing the "old order" on October 15, 1979, the first revolutionary government in El Salvador came apart, unable to transmute its lofty pronouncements for reform and social justice into policy. Few inside or outside El Salvador thought that the new Christian Democratic-military coalition would have any more success implementing the reforms or even surviving. But with firm pressure from the U.S.—the threat to suspend aid, the promise to increase it once the reforms were promulgated—the Salvadoran government announced the reforms and began the long, hard process of carrying them out. There had been warnings that the reforms would weaken and divide the government. Instead, the reforms weakened the left and helped the government widen its precarious base.

Even in the closing days of the Carter Administration, the blunt instrument of conditionality succeeded in moving the military. In December 1980, after the wanton murder of six leftist democratic leaders and of four American religious workers, President Carter suspended all economic and military aid until the military complied with the ultimatum of the Christian Democrats in the government, who had threatened to withdraw unless the violence was brought under control. The military agreed to investigate the murders of the Americans, to reorganize the government to give greater authority to Duarte, and to transfer or dismiss a dozen key military officers associated with the repression, including Vice Minister of Defense Nicholas Carranza. In return, the U.S. reactivated economic and "nonlethal" military aid, but withheld "lethal" military aid until the government took six additional specific steps in the murder investigation, including giving the U.S. a list of the security forces in the area. In early January 1981, after the government took these six steps, and after the leftist offensive on January 10 revealed that the left had covertly received large quantities of military supplies, the U.S. released \$5 million of military aid. Not surprisingly, human rights progress has halted since the Reagan Administration discarded the lever of conditionality. But there continues to be evidence that conditionality can work. How else can one explain why the Salvadoran government has taken another step forward in the religious workers' case now that the Reagan Administration is about to go to Capitol Hill to ask for more funding?

Conditionality can work, but four lessons based on the experience of the Carter years are worth noting. First, even though Salvadoran military chiefs—and perhaps even Duarte—will complain about having their arms twisted in public, the U.S. should never rule out public pressure even as it tries to do as much as possible privately. Second, after consulting with the Christian Democrats and others genuinely concerned about the repression, the U.S. should name specific indicators that would demonstrate the military's sincerity in gaining control of the violence. Such indicators could include: the dismissal of Colonel Francisco Antonio Moran, head of the Treasury Police; the abolition of the Treasury Police and the National Guard or their consolidation under the army; completion within six months of the trial of the six National Guardsmen accused of murdering the religious workers; and reassignment—either out of the country or into prison—of a dozen or so of the most repressive officers. Third, each large step—like the agrarian reform—actually represents hundreds of microscopic steps that require constant prodding and pushing. There

were something like two hundred individual steps between the murder of the religious workers and the indictments of the six National Guardsmen. Such procrastination is infuriating, but the U.S. cannot afford to relax the pressure. Fourth, the U.S. should be realistic and recognize that success may be partial. Bargaining over repression is gruesome, but it is the only choice between giving up on the military or giving in to its atrocities.

(2) *Negotiations.* The closest both sides have come to talking was in September 1980, when Archbishop Arturo Rivera y Damas offered to mediate. Duarte quickly accepted on behalf of the government, and U.S. Ambassador Robert White used his influence to keep the military from vetoing it. The leftists, however, rejected the offer, insisting instead on two preconditions: first, they would negotiate only with the U.S.; and second, they would negotiate only if there were a restructuring of the armed forces and dismissal of García, Gutiérrez, and others. That was the state-of-play on negotiations until June 1981, when the international democratic left convinced the guerrillas that they could regain the political initiative if they dropped the two preconditions. They did so. The response of the government and the Reagan Administration was to block negotiations by interposing a new precondition of their own: negotiations could begin only when the left gave up their arms.

The Reagan Administration says it would be wrong to negotiate with—and thereby to legitimize—those who seek to change the government by violence. But that notion, applied consistently, would also preclude the U.S. from talking to the current government, which came to power by force. A more important (and sustainable) view is that the U.S. should not in these circumstances allow itself to appear as the obstacle to negotiations that could reduce violence. The Administration's second objection is more pragmatic: if the Communists are permitted a power-sharing arrangement through negotiations, they will ultimately take over the government. However, if the Administration believes that only the left can manipulate the negotiations, it is doing nothing more than confessing its own incompetence. Moreover, now that the left has dropped its preconditions, there is no reason why power-sharing should be the agenda—or even be on it.

The irony is that perhaps the only reason the left stays unified is our unwillingness to talk to them. Rather than fearing negotiations, we should welcome them as the best, and perhaps the only, way to move El Salvador from civil war toward credible elections, to divide the left between those civilians who believe in democracy and those guerrillas who don't, to discipline the excesses of both the security forces and the guerrillas, and to mend fences with Mexico and our European allies on this issue.

How can negotiations produce these outcomes? We are fortunate that the nominal head of the left is a Social Democrat, Guillermo Ungo, and of the government a Christian Democrat, Duarte. Potential international sponsors (or guarantors) of the left could be Mexico, France, the Social Democratic parties of Germany, Spain, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic. The sponsors of the governments of Venezuela, the U.S., and perhaps Costa Rica. We should exploit the fact that our friends—not Cuba or the Soviet Union—could serve as international sponsors of the left and could assert

tutary responsibility over the guerrillas, as we seek to do with the security forces. Such an alignment would strengthen moderates like Duarte and Ungo.

The Administration should embrace Mexican President José López Portillo's peace proposal of February 21 and use it as a means for bringing all sides to the bargaining table. López Portillo thinks there is room for compromise between those who argue for elections without negotiations and those who argue for negotiations without elections—and there is.

Negotiations could begin by seeking to build trust and confidence: ceasefires should be declared in certain areas and enforced by international peacekeeping forces, representing the international sponsors. The areas in the ceasefire zone should be gradually expanded. The second subject for negotiations should be the conditions necessary to guarantee a free and fair election. Given the current violence—for which the guerrillas share the responsibility—it is understandable, if not justified, that the democratic left is boycotting the March 28 elections. (Indeed, the Christian Democrats may be making an irrevocable mistake by participating in that election. Though it may not be the first time the right steals an election from them, it could well be the last.)

The left will insist on restructuring the armed forces to eliminate the repression. But that is equally in the U.S. interest. The Salvadoran government, however, should obtain, as a *quid pro quo*, an agreement from the left (or some portion of it) to participate in an electoral process and to disband at least one of its more atrocity-prone guerrilla groups.

Once negotiations become meaningful, if not before, the left will almost certainly split, and the military may do so as well. Indeed, some of the guerrilla leadership is likely to try to sabotage negotiations from the beginning. In an interview with a Mexican newspaper in 1980, Cayetano Carpio, the founder of the Faribundo Martí Popular Forces for Liberation, and now the top guerrilla leader, explained why he resigned from the Communist Party a decade before: "Because of the Cuban Revolution . . . I understood that the transformation in Latin America is by the path of war. The Salvadoran Communist Party held that the path was politics and that only at the end, when the final blow was to be aimed, should arms be used." Carpio's group has since boasted of assassinating a moderate education minister, a respected foreign minister (Mauricio Borronovo, in 1977), and the Swiss chargé; of seizing the Costa Rican, Venezuelan, and French embassies; and of numerous bombings of electric power stations and buses. Joaquin Villalobos, founder of the People's Revolutionary Army (ERP), in 1974 "executed" his chief rival in the ERP, Roque Dalton. Dalton's followers split to form a new guerrilla group, the FARN. The FARN's leader, Ernesto Jovel, was killed in a plane crash in mysterious circumstances in 1980, just after his group—allegedly the most barbaric—refused Castro's overtures to cooperate with the others. In an interview before his death, he held up a list of names of journalists and others whom he accused of favoring the government, and warned them that if they didn't leave the country soon, they "will be executed." Much of this sanguinary history is described in Gabriel Zaid's excellent article, "Enemy Colleagues: A Reading of the Salvadoran Tragedy," in the Winter 1982 issue of *Dissent*.

It is scarcely likely that such people will trust in a democratic framework. But if they don't, the negotiations ought to aim to restrict their power—and to encourage those who have swelled the guerrilla ranks in the last year because of repression to return home. The very fact of negotiations would begin this process. Just as important is the return to active political life of the democratic left. This can only be made possible by negotiations leading to an international authority to guarantee free, fair, and safe elections.

Limits. What could be more self-defeating, Secretary of State Haig asked Robin McNeil on February 16, than to rule out military options? The answer to Haig's rhetorical question is the opposite of what he imagines. Haig should ask himself why it is that spokesmen for the left repeatedly invite the United States to send troops. The truth is that a U.S. combat presence would be an injection of nationalistic adrenalin for the guerrillas, making credible their assertions that they are really fighting U.S. imperialism. It would change the character of the war overnight, creating the basis for a long-term Communist-nationalist movement that could not be defeated. In any case, Congress would correctly reject it, and, under the War Powers Act, the troops would be out in ninety days. The United States would look either ignorant or impotent, depending on which end of Pennsylvania Avenue you work. By refusing to rule out military options, Haig buys only grief for himself, and gives a propaganda point to the guerrillas. To set limits on our involvement in El Salvador is in fact to enhance our capacity to influence developments there.

The three-part strategy of conditionality (linking our support to genuine progress in reducing the repression), negotiations (with the left under the sponsorship of Mexico, Venezuela, and other friends), and setting limits to our involvement can succeed. That strategy would have an additional dividend. The debate in the U.S. is shaping up between those who want to stop the Communists and those who don't want to support a repressive government. The strategy outlined here can serve as a bridge between those two positions, between Congress and the executive, and between the political parties. This could also help to gain support for the Administration's Caribbean Basin Initiative.

The Administration should urge negotiations immediately—before the March 28 elections. Afterward, it could be too late. If the Christian Democrats lose, we could find ourselves tied to an indefensible regime, not a more legitimate one, and the game will be up.

But if the Administration holds to its current disastrous strategy and fails to grasp the thread of the policy emerging from Congress, the American people should know whom to blame if the left (or the extreme right) seizes power in El Salvador. It won't be Congress. ●

THE 63D ANNUAL OBSERVANCE— PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in com-

memorating Public Schools Week during the month of April. This year will be the 63d annual observance of Public Schools Week, such observance having been initiated by the Masonic Grand Lodge in California, September 27, 1920.

Public Schools Week has always had the purpose of calling attention to the public schools, their strengths and their weaknesses. By inviting parents and the general public to visit the schools at this time of the year, public schools hope to enlighten the public on current issues schools must deal with.

Our country has had a deep and abiding interest in the education of its citizens since the days of the very early colonies. Massachusetts passed America's first general school law in 1647 requiring each town "to teach all—children—to write and to read."

Benjamin Franklin, always a strong supporter of practical public education, once said:

The good education of youth has been esteemed by wise men in all ages as the surest foundation of the happiness both of private families and of commonwealths.

Thomas Jefferson, creator of so much that is now good and great in our country, said:

Above all things, I hope the education of the common people will be attended to; convinced that on this good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty.

Later he said,

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

Today our public schools are in serious trouble. In California the effects of proposition 13, passed in 1978, are now having their most disturbing impact. The financing of public schools is being challenged as never before in our lifetimes. Budget proposals put forward by our President have cut significantly into those Federal funds that might have helped our schools and their financial plight.

During the month of April, let us all pause from time to time to consider how best to deal with public education. Let us all visit our public schools and discuss with our educators the problems they face today. And finally in our homes may we all increase our efforts to encourage our children to put forth their best effort in the short time they are in our public school classrooms. ●

THE DINGELL-BROYHILL-LUKEN CLEAN AIR ACT AMEND- MENTS—A DIRTY DEAL FOR CLEAN AIR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Energy and Commerce continues its mark up of amendments to the Clean Air Act, it is important for the House to understand what is at stake here. The version adopted by the subcommittee is, of course, completely unacceptable to those who seek balance and those who really care about the public health and welfare.

At this time, I do not intend to belabor the specifics of what is wrong with the Dingell-Broyhill-Luken amendments. However, I do wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial by the chair of the California Air Resources Board on the harm this bill will do the clean air efforts.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 6, 1982]

DIRTY DEAL FOR CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC HEALTH—WEAKENING OF CLEAN AIR ACT WOULD AFFECT STATE'S STRICTER CONTROLS

(By Mary D. Nichols)

The Clean Air Act, which guides the national effort to control smog, expired last year. Congress has thus far failed to renew the act's basic commitment to eliminate unhealthy air because of a purely political impasse between the will of the public and the demands of industry. The result is a dirty deal for California's public health.

Many weeks of congressional hearings last year failed to reveal any reason to weaken automobile emission limits adopted a decade ago.

The technology already exists, and the standards are needed to reduce excessive pollution levels in the country's major urban areas. Automobile manufacturers have urged a relaxation in the standards that would double the emissions of cars being sold today. They have pleaded general economic hardship, which is undeniable, but have failed to provide any evidence that rolling back standards would improve their situation. On the contrary, Wall Street analysts have pointed out that, if U.S. auto makers take advantage of the higher limits to remove electronic controls that have been developed in the past few years to improve fuel economy and driveability, Japanese cars will become even more competitive in the marketplace than they are today.

Despite polls that show overwhelming public opposition to weakening the Clean Air Act, the House subcommittee on health and environment recently passed a comprehensive set of amendments that included every change asked by the auto industry.

The authors of the bill are Reps. John D. Dingell of Michigan and Thomas A. Luken of Ohio, two Democrats whose districts have been hit hard by auto-industry layoffs. It has the support of President Reagan and is expected to reach the House floor. There its future is far less certain.

Dingell and Luken claim that their bill would make little or no difference to air quality, but would merely "streamline" the Clean Air Act to remove unnecessary impediments to industrial growth. I contend that the Dingell-Luken measure would set back California's air-quality-control program at least a decade.

The 1970 Clean Air Act made a major breakthrough in air-pollution control by establishing technology-forcing automobile standards. It also established a powerful three-pronged weapon for attacking unhealthy air quality: (1) The Environmental Protection Agency was required to set air-quality standards at levels designed to protect sensitive members of the public such as children and old people, (2) Congress set deadlines for the attainment of those standards by the states, and (3) the deadlines were made enforceable by the Environmental Protection Agency or by individual citizens through a variety of sanctions.

The Dingell-Luken bill would effectively eliminate deadlines and sanctions, leaving the standards with no incentives or tools to attain them.

The measure would pre-empt California's 5-year/50,000-mile warranty for emission-control systems, replacing it with a flimsy 2-year/24,000-mile warranty limited to add-on pollution equipment. This would mean less durable cars and higher repair costs, as well as worse emissions for older cars as drivers decide to forgo emission-related repairs.

In addition, the control of emissions from oil tankers would be totally pre-empted. The Environmental Protection Agency may adopt emission limits, but probably won't. Meanwhile, the development of California's offshore resources is expanding rapidly, and any state or local efforts to mitigate the effects of additional tanker traffic would be frustrated.

We can be certain that pressures to roll back California's more stringent auto-emission standards will mount as the gap between state and federal standards widens. While California has had its own stricter requirements for certification, maintenance, warranty, assembly-line and in-use testing, tailpipe standards have moved closer to the federal levels in recent years. New California cars match cars sold in other states in terms of fuel economy, price and availability of models, but they also emit half as much nitrogen oxide. That could change dramatically.

Industrial pollution would also be more difficult to control if this measure became law. It would eliminate the requirement that new industries in smoggy regions use control techniques representing the "lowest achievable emission rate"—that is, the best control that has been demonstrated anywhere.

Instead, states would be required only to define a lowest-common-denominator or economically "reasonable" level. This represents a potential difference of hundreds of tons a year in pollution from new facilities. Moreover, whatever controls are required would be frozen for 10 years under the "regulatory stability" provisions of the act. Since even areas that could meet the national air-quality standards by the current 1982 deadline would receive an automatic extension to 1987, and all areas would be able to obtain deadline extensions to 1993 with no additional effort, any incentive for industries to clean up existing sources would be eliminated.

Of course, California could again go its own way and press for tougher measures

than the rest of the nation is using. Experience tells us that few local air pollution control districts will impose tough, costly control measures opposed by local industries, which can threaten to move elsewhere.

The innovative, technology-forcing measures adopted in California during the last 10 years were required to meet federally imposed deadlines; local elected officials tell us that, without those requirements, we can expect little further progress.●

TOWARD A PEACEFUL SOLUTION IN EL SALVADOR

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, the situation in El Salvador today is first and foremost a tragedy for the Salvadoran people. Out of all the conflicting interpretations there have been of the conduct and outcome of the elections, one message has emerged which is beyond dispute: The overwhelming desire of the Salvadoran people themselves for an end to the violence.

My fear is that this message will once again fall on deaf ears in Washington. My fear is that, once again, the administration will attempt to make the facts of the real world fit its pre-conceived ideological framework; that it will continue to pursue a course which will have the effect of prolonging and escalating the violence in El Salvador; and that, in the process, it will do irreversible damage not only to American security interests in the region, but to the entire international credibility and standing of the U.S. Government.

In its dealings with the situation in Central America, the administration appears to have lost sight of two things which are indispensable to the effective conduct of foreign policy: A sense of reality, and a sense of principle. According to Secretary of State Haig:

Our problem in El Salvador is external intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state in the hemisphere—nothing more, nothing less. That is the essential problem we are dealing with.

However, this analysis of the situation is simply not one shared by our friends and neighbors in the region, nor by any of our major allies. That alone should give us pause for thought. President Lopez Portillo of Mexico, in his speech in Managua several weeks ago in which he launched his now famous peace initiative, put it this way:

The distinguishing feature that today marks the destiny of the Central American people and the Caribbean is their struggle for the profound transformation of the secular social, economic and political conditions that have imposed on them poverty, tyranny and oppression. Whoever does not

understand this will not manage to understand the dramatic convulsions that are agitating the area . . . Who could dare today to write off as a mere effect of the expansionism of one superpower or another the immense wave of national liberation that shook the third world in the last thirty years? That is why we reiterate what has been said, in public and private, to each other: the Central American and Caribbean revolutions are, above all, struggles of poor and oppressed peoples to live better and more freely. To say that they are something else and to act as if they were is counterproductive: one ends up by achieving that which one wanted to avoid . . .

It is ironic that our country, of all countries, should fail to recognize the reality of what is happening in Central America. It is ironic that we should, once again, find ourselves on the side of those who would try to block change and to prevent reform. The danger, as President Kennedy foresaw only too clearly, is that "those who make peaceful evolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable."

Our Government is making the same tragic mistake in El Salvador as it has so often before in its dealings with the developing world—that of equating political stability with the maintenance of the status quo. Instead of allying itself with moderate forces working for reform, the administration has been sending increasing amounts of military hardware to arm one of the most ruthless and brutal armies anywhere in the Western World. The predictable result has been to weaken and alienate the moderate center, to strengthen the men of violence on both sides, and to leave opponents of the regime with no choice but to look to Cuba and Nicaragua for help and support. By our own actions we are creating opportunities for the Soviets and the Cubans to extend their influence, and by our own actions we risk turning the conflict in Central America into a superpower conflict. As President Lopez Portillo predicted the prospect is that we shall end up achieving that which we wanted to avoid: Providing the opportunity for a Communist government to gain a foothold on the mainland.

It is a tragedy that, at a critical moment in the history of Central America, our Government has so completely failed to understand the nature of the problem with which it is dealing that it has missed a great opportunity to play a constructive part in the development of democracy and political stability in the small republics that are our neighbors. It is also a tragedy for the Salvadoran people and for those moderate elements in Nicaragua still struggling to prevent the revolution there from moving even further in the direction of totalitarianism. But it is also a tragedy for the American people.

In letter after letter to Members of Congress, Americans have expressed

their shame at finding their Government, in violation of every principle of respect for human rights in which they were brought up to believe, arming a military that has been responsible for the murder of thousands of its fellow citizens, and planning covert operations against a small neighbor with which it is ostensibly at peace. They have made clear their overwhelming opposition to further U.S. military involvement in El Salvador, and above all their opposition to sending U.S. troops there. And they have expressed their disgust at the manner in which the administration has tried to manipulate the facts of the situation to fit its own purposes and ideological preconceptions: From the white paper last year so full of unfounded assertions and half-truths to the President's certification at the beginning of this year that the preconditions set by Congress for further military aid to El Salvador—including a concerted effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights—had been met. Understandably, the American people are asking themselves: Who or what are we fighting for in El Salvador?

President Lopez Portillo, in presenting his peace initiative, said that:

It is based on a simple but decisive idea: that if each accepts the fact that neighbor must and can live the way that seems best to him, the differences of interests and recourses are surmountable through the negotiated route. Mexico does not defend, on the external plane, ideologies of any kind. It defends principles. It defends the supreme right of peoples to free determination and of respect for the sovereignty of each country.

I wish it had been an American President who had spoken those words. How different the recent history of our country would have been had our foreign policy been based on this simple but decisive idea, and had our policies been based on the defense of principles, not ideologies.

We should not be naive about the potential threat to U.S. security interests in Central America. We should not underestimate the difficulties and complexities of the situation there. We must not be apologists for the men of violence on either side. But we must recognize that military intervention is not the answer to containing or ending the conflict in Central America. There, as elsewhere in the Third World, the biggest threat to our security comes from the conditions of poverty and injustice that are the breeding grounds for violent revolution, and which open up to Cuba or the Soviet Union the opportunities to fish in troubled waters. We must understand once and for all, that we cannot hope to stop the spread of communism by supporting repressive dictatorships that violate human rights. Such support is not only repugnant to the American people, but it also plays di-

rectly into the hands of the Soviets and their surrogates.

We must reintroduce both realism and principle into our Central American policy. We must make clear our unalterable opposition to military establishments which maintain themselves in power by oppression. We must take our stand in support of peaceful change and the promotion of social and economic justice. Above all we must stop the dishonest manipulation of facts to suit our own purposes.

In many ways last month's elections, but further polarizing the situation in El Salvador, has made a negotiated settlement to the conflict there more difficult. By the same token, however, it has made the search for a peaceful solution all the more urgent. President Portillo has offered to act as a channel of communication, and has proposed a series of steps to defuse the mounting tension in the region. Nicaragua and, just recently, Cuba, have both indicated their readiness to begin negotiations with us with the aim of finding a political solution to the conflict in El Salvador. We should respond—not negatively or ambiguously as we have done to date—but positively and in a spirit of good faith.

Our country was born in revolution, and claims the leadership of the free world. Yet how can we expect our protests about violations of human rights in Afghanistan or Poland to be taken seriously when we support the military in El Salvador and remain silent about oppression in South Africa? Time and time again we have failed to provide the leadership that could help promote peaceful change. We still have such an opportunity in El Salvador today. We cannot afford to throw it away. ●

A TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY J. LEVOY

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a dedicated citizen and outstanding member of my home district, Mr. Anthony J. Levoy of Wharton, N.J.

Mr. Levoy, who will celebrate his 50th year of active service in the Active Hose Company No. 1 of the Wharton Fire Department on May 2, 1982, will be applauded by his friends and colleagues at a testimonial ceremony on May 14, 1982.

The achievements of Anthony Levoy are truly impressive. As an elected member of the Active Hose Company No. 1, he put his exceptional abilities and talents to good use through service on such company and departmen-

tal committees as entertainment and investigating.

During the years of 1935 and 1936, Mr. Levoy's colleagues showed their respect for him by naming him vice president of the Active Hose Company No. 1. He maintained this position in conjunction with that of assistant foreman in 1937.

The tradition of impressive leadership embodied in the Active Hose Company was continued when Anthony Levoy was appointed to the offices of president and foreman in 1938. In that year, these offices were consolidated into that of captain, making Mr. Levoy the first captain to serve in the Active Hose Company.

He became exempt fireman on May 16, 1939, and has since continued his service as an active fireman and department supporter through the present time.

This illustrious record of accomplishments demonstrates Mr. Levoy's many contributions to his colleagues and his community. I am sure that I voice the feelings of his family and friends when I say that Anthony J. Levoy is truly a compassionate, dedicated, and talented human being. And I would add, in closing, that I wish Mr. Levoy the best of luck throughout his career in the Active Hose Company and in all of his future endeavors.●

SUPREME PRESIDENT GUSTAV COFFINAS OF AHEPA CELEBRATES HIS BIRTHDAY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this evening I shall have the pleasure of attending a meeting of the Lord Baltimore Chapter of the National Order of AHEPA, the largest Greek American fraternal organization in the world.

Special guest this evening will be Supreme President Gustav Coffinas, who is celebrating his birthday today. Mr. Coffinas has held elective offices in AHEPA from the local to the national level throughout his 36 years of active membership.

A native of Brooklyn, N.Y., he served in the Air Force during World War II, and was graduated from St. John's University and School of Law. He began his distinguished law career in 1952, and is licensed to practice in all New York courts, before the Supreme Court, the Department of Justice, and the Board of Immigration Appeals.

A leader in Brooklyn's Greek community, he is founder of the Fantis Parochial School—the first Greek Orthodox grammar school in Brooklyn.

As supreme president of AHEPA, he oversees the activities of the national organization which include the founding of St. Basil's Academy in Garrison, N.Y.—a home for orphaned Greek American boys, and the establishment of a hospital in Greece.

He is visiting the Lord Baltimore Chapter of AHEPA tonight to celebrate the unveiling of plans for a new community center which will include a physical fitness center, a senior citizens center, entertainment and meeting facilities, an indoor-outdoor swimming pool, day care center, tennis and basketball courts, and picnic grounds.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Coffinas on the occasion of his birthday, and welcome him to our community.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH BUDGET AND THE ALTERNATIVES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear over the past 2 months that the President's budget is a discredited document. Its policies are so harsh, and so far removed from reality, that the budget cannot be repaired with short-term incremental tinkering. Health programs, for example, are targeted for more than \$5 billion in short-term cuts that would do nothing to encourage more efficiency in the health system. Instead, they would simply shift costs from the Federal budget to others—to hard-pressed State and local governments and taxpayers, to health providers and their patients, to health insurers and their premium payors, and ultimately to the vulnerable citizens that these programs serve—the aged, the disabled, the children, the poor, and the ill.

The Congress is now proceeding with the difficult task of developing an alternative economic and budgetary policy that reflects our Nation's real priorities and serves its most basic human needs. The necessary starting point is the development of the broad outlines of revenue, domestic spending, defense spending, and deficit targets. Many of these proposals focus on the entitlement programs, such as medicare and medicaid. They seem conceptually simple and straightforward, and their generic outlines may sound appealing in the abstract. However, there are three critical issues that must be considered in reviewing these budgetary proposals.

First, they are based on the presumption that we have to cut health programs further, despite the fact that last year's Reconciliation Act cut health programs by \$2.8 billion in

fiscal year 1982, and programed another \$2.8 billion cut into fiscal year 1983.

Second, they would force us to make short-term cuts and cost shifts, similar in nature to those proposed by the administration. While there is general agreement that we need to move toward some type of long-range health system reforms, we simply cannot achieve billions of dollars of fiscal year 1983 savings from such reforms. Instead, we would have to turn again to short-term shifts to States, providers, insurers, and program beneficiaries, which guarantee us the same, or even worse, problems in the years ahead.

Third, if we approve budgetary proposals with substantial health cuts, the particular program changes that would be required will be complex and very controversial. It is all well and good to support macroeconomic targets that produce a more politically appealing deficit. However, we should not endorse these broad targets unless we are at the same time personally committed to voting for the controversial program changes required to reach them. The danger is that we support a savings target based on a controversial proposal such as reimbursement reforms, but then fail to support the actual legislative change. If that occurred, we would be forced to turn to more damaging short-term cuts and cost shifts to reach the pre-established savings target.

In order to evaluate fully these broad budgetary policy prescriptions for entitlement programs, it is necessary to assess their potential impact on medicaid and medicare. The following sections detail that impact.

MEDICAID

Any limit on the rate of increase in the Federal share of medicaid spending, such as a linkage to the CPI, forces the development of a medicaid cap. Last year, the Reagan administration proposed just such a cap. It was vigorously opposed by States, local governments, and the beneficiaries as a major retreat in the Federal commitment to health care for the poor, and it was rejected by the Congress.

However, substantial cuts were still made. The Reconciliation Act reduced the Federal medicaid contribution by \$0.9 billion in fiscal year 1982, and the conferees explicitly agreed to extend those cuts for a full 3-year period. States are now desperately trying to cope with this year's reduction, and are confronting the fact that medicaid is already programed for additional cuts of \$0.9 billion in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984.

What could the States do in response to further Federal cuts? We should not kid ourselves that they could respond with long-range reforms. In fact, most long-range medicaid reform proposals entail more

equity among the States in eligibility and benefit levels, and usually a stronger Federal financial role—not more Federal cuts. Instead, the States would have to make up for the Federal withdrawal either by increasing State and local funding and taxes, or by cutting into the program itself.

We also should not kid ourselves that such cuts will be easy, or harmless. There seems to be an implicit assumption among Washington budgeteers that the Medicaid program has never been under fiscal pressure, and that by making these huge Federal cuts we can finally force the States to examine their Medicaid programs more closely. The presumed result would be that they will find areas to cut without much harm.

If the underlying assumption were correct, such fiscal management tactics might be warranted. However, as anyone familiar with State government and budgeting over the past decade knows, the assumption is totally false. The States have always had a large financial stake in Medicaid, and the program has been under fiscal pressure, enormous pressure at the State level, since enactment. States have had to examine and reexamine their Medicaid programs for years, and make hard choices of what to cover and what to cut, and how to improve efficiency to get the most out of their investment.

We are now at the point that Medicaid covers just 53 percent of the poverty population. Eligibility levels are below \$250 per month for a family of four in about one-fifth of the States and jurisdictions administering the program. Nearly one-half of program payments go for long-term care services, the need for which will continue to grow with the aging of the Nation's population. Benefits are increasingly restricted, and last year's cuts were accompanied with increased flexibility in setting reimbursement rates and defining coverage groups.

I would urge my colleagues to consider seriously whether they can or should support further reduction in Federal funds to the States for Medicaid. If more Federal cuts are enacted, the States would have to finance the benefits from State and local revenues and taxpayers, or shift the costs: Shift them to beneficiaries as cuts in basic eligibility or benefit levels, or shift them to providers as additional reimbursement cuts. It is important to understand that the costs do not go away, they are simply shifted to those less able to finance them—Federal to State—State to local government, beneficiary, or provider—beneficiary or provider bad debts to other patients, or back to local governments. We still end up financing the care as a society—we just have the accountants move the costs to meet the political needs of the day. Unfortunately, in the process,

we wreak havoc on State and local governments, and reduce access to critical services for the neediest aged, disabled, and children in our society.

I believe if my colleagues consider these issues, they will conclude as I have that further cuts in this mean-tested health care program are not supportable.

MEDICARE

Proposals such as Senator DOMENICI's original suggestion to limit the increase in entitlement programs to the CPI would also impact on the Medicare program. Under Medicare, such a limit presents us with two difficult options. Since this is a Federal program, we do not have the luxury of being able to shift costs to the States. Instead, we will have to make the choices ourselves. The two generic options are as follows:

Raise the amounts directly paid out of pocket by the aged and disabled beneficiaries.

Set stringent limits on reimbursement levels to providers, such as hospitals and physicians.

RAISE AMOUNTS PAID BY BENEFICIARIES

There are three basic methods for achieving Federal savings by increasing costs for the aged and disabled: increased premiums, increased cost sharing, and limits on benefits provided.

The budget target could require an increase in the monthly premium paid for part B of Medicare. Currently, the aged and disabled pay \$11 per month, and that rate will rise to \$12.20 as of July 1. Current law limits the increase to no more than the rate of increase in social security cash benefits. However, a budgetary target could require that we change that limit and allow the premium to rise faster than cash benefits. The result would be that 29 million aged and disabled enrollees would have to devote ever-increasing portions of their income to medical care as a means of reducing Federal outlays.

Another choice under a budget cut could be to increase Medicare cost sharing. For example, the part B deductible was raised by the Congress from \$60 to \$75 last year. Federal outlays would be reduced if we raised this amount paid by the beneficiaries even higher, as the President has recommended. Another type of increased cost sharing would be for inpatient hospital stays. The President is apparently prepared to propose 6 percent cost sharing, or \$18 per day, starting with the second day of hospital care. This would reduce Federal outlays by increasing the amount paid out of pocket by the aged and disabled individuals who have to go to the hospital for medical problems. For the average stay of 11 days, the aged or disabled beneficiary would pay \$180 more than they currently pay.

The final alternative would be to set limits on the services covered under

the Medicare program. Currently, Medicare covers 90 days of inpatient hospital care per spell of illness, with a 60-day "lifetime reserve", 100 days of skilled nursing home care, home health care, outpatient hospital care, and physicians' services. Any one of these services could be limited or cut as a savings device, leaving the costs to the aged and disabled.

All of these alternatives would achieve Federal savings by directly increasing the out-of-pocket payments for some or all of the 29 million aged and disabled individuals enrolled under Medicare. The question we must confront is whether shifting more costs to these population groups makes any sense at all. Medicare currently pays less than 45 percent of the total health bill of the aged, and there is no apparent rationale for exposing them to further expenditures other than short-term and short-sighted budgetary cuts. Before endorsing budgetary proposals that would require these kinds of cuts, I would encourage the members to contemplate whether they could in good conscience vote for proposals hurting 29 million aged and disabled enrollees in the Medicare component of our Nation's social security system. I believe the answer will be "no."

LIMIT REIMBURSEMENT TO PROVIDERS

HOSPITALS

The principal alternative to cost sharing or service cuts would be limits on reimbursement paid to providers, such as hospitals and physicians. Savings targets could require that we revise Medicare hospital reimbursement and set limits on how much we pay for those services. I have long advocated moving toward a more prospective system that provided incentives for hospitals to serve the beneficiaries more efficiently and effectively. This type of long-range reform could be coupled with interim rate-of-increase limits, adjusted for relative efficiency, to increase the short-term budgetary savings. If the Congress decides to require some savings in the health function, it would appear to be logical to consider this type of program.

However, these long-range reforms are complex and controversial proposals, which by their very nature do not lend themselves to the immediacy of a reconciliation process. They require changes in the basic methods of payment for more than \$30 billion of hospital care—changes that would be both analytically and politically difficult. Reconciliation is a particularly inappropriate vehicle for such reforms. In addition, I must remind the Members of the enormous political difficulties encountered the last time we attempted to address the hospital cost issue. Many of us worked hard to develop a proposal, only to have it defeated on

the floor of the House. Strong leadership would be required from the administration on an issue like this. It may be easy to support general savings targets in this area, but I would urge the Members to give that support to the overall budgetary package only if you are prepared to personally vote for the required reimbursement cuts, despite their inevitable complexity and controversy. Otherwise, we would be forced to turn to harsher cuts for the elderly and disabled.

PHYSICIANS

A reimbursement limitation could also be required for physician services. For example, a CPI-related limit on aggregate payments could require us to limit the rate of increase in physician fees under medicare.

While that sounds like a simple proposal, it is important for everyone to understand its impact on program beneficiaries as well as on physicians. Physicians currently have an option as to whether they accept medicare payment as payment in full, which is known as accepting "assignment." If they do accept assignment, the beneficiary is liable for only their 20-percent coinsurance. However, if the physician chooses not to accept assignment, the beneficiary is liable for their 20-percent coinsurance, plus any charges that medicare does not pay. These extra charges, over and above what medicare defines as reasonable, are currently passed on to the beneficiary on about one-half of the physician bills submitted. As a result of this option available to the physicians, the charges that are unpaid and "saved" through these caps could be shifted to the aged and disabled beneficiaries. The unfortunate result of further limits on payments to physicians would likely be a sharp decrease in the number of physicians accepting assignment—exacerbating the problems we already face in this area.

It is important to note that this kind of control does nothing about the volume of services—while the price paid per visit would be limited, the number of visits that the physician could provide is not. If the budgetary proposal provides for strict aggregate spending caps, all our experience indicates that the volume of services would be likely to increase. There would have to be more and more government use of utilization controls. If volume still increased, tighter and tighter restrictions might be required on the price per visit in order to achieve the target.

Medicare currently pays less than 55 percent of the physician expenditures of our Nation's elderly citizens. The rationale for further shifts of costs to that population is highly questionable. We must carefully consider whether we want to support such reimbursement cuts for physicians and cost shifts to the aged and disabled. Again,

I believe the answer of most members would be "no."

CONCLUSION

These health programs were slashed severely last year, and no matter how we arrive at them, further cuts will be harmful and difficult to enact. A fiscal year 1983 budget that required additional reductions would force us to turn once again to short-term cuts and cost shifts that do nothing to address the underlying issues that we all recognize. The budgetary process does not lend itself to the development of long-range health system reforms. Such reforms are too complex and controversial for a reconciliation process, and do not yield the first year savings that we would force upon ourselves if we continue our annual budgetary madness.

As we continue to grapple with the broad outlines of various budgetary alternatives, I urge my colleagues to consider their impact on health programs, so that we do not end up including unnecessary and short-sighted health cuts and cost shifts as part of the final package that we develop. ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS J. VITI—A VIETNAM WAR HERO GETS LONG OVERDUE RECOGNITION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a high personal honor to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Leatherneck magazine paying tribute to a constituent of mine Dr. Thomas J. Viti.

While in the chronological sense—the Vietnam war is somewhat dated as a subject—when stories of heroes such as Dr. Viti become known—they are timeless in terms of their significance and relevance. Dr. Tom as he was affectionately known by the thousands he served in Vietnam—provided critically needed medical services in the dangerous An Hoa province of South Vietnam. As the article indicates—almost on a daily basis—Dr. Tom would risk his life to try and save the lives of others who were victims of the violence of war.

Dr. Tom was so successful in his work that Vietnamese from other provinces would trek to An Hoa to be treated by Dr. Tom. This served to enrage the Viet Cong which according to the article branded Dr. Tom "Public Enemy No. 1 and put a price on his head." Undaunted, Dr. Tom continued his work.

Dr. Tom after his 2-years stint in Vietnam returned to the United States and switched his attentions to the other returning American servicemen

from Vietnam. He worked to help smooth the transition for these soldiers back to civilian life. This was not an easy task because unlike the soldiers who returned from other wars—the American public was not as responsive.

Dr. Tom after completing 2 years in Vietnam returned to the United States and embarked on an equally difficult mission—to aid the transition to civilian life of soldiers returning from Vietnam.

He provided valuable counseling services for many returning servicemen from the Bronx and even helped some obtain gainful employment.

Today Dr. Tom Viti is still serving people with a successful private practice in the Bronx. Yet as this article points out—his relationship with the An Hoa people has not been severed. He still organizes fund raising drives to help send food, clothing and medicine for the clinic where he worked.

Time has done nothing but enhance the remarkable accomplishments of Dr. Tom Viti. It has been my pleasure to know this fine man for a number of years and I know him to be a man of commitment and dedication to helping his fellow man. In Vietnam—he was a true patriot. A popular song from several years ago was entitled "Heroes Are Hard to Find." Dr. Tom Viti is an American hero whose story follows in this article from Leatherneck magazine authored by his colleague Maj. Richard Esau, Jr.

DR. TOM'S WAR

(By Maj. Richard Esau, Jr.)

Bullets tore through the hovering helicopter as Dr. Tom Viti prepared to jump into the flooded rice paddy. Above him, the helicopter's gunners blazed back at the encircling enemy. On Dr. Viti's back was a medical knapsack. Extra canteens for the wounded were entwined in his flak jacket, restricting his arm movement. It did not make his exit from the helo while under fire any easier. Just as he was ready to go, his helmet tipped over his eyes. He jumped anyway, and landed on his back, up to his neck in the flooded rice paddy.

A moment later, Dr. Tom was on his feet, stumbling toward one of his corpsmen, who was crouched behind a paddy dike a hundred meters away, desperately trying to keep a wounded Marine alive.

"He's gone, Doctor, I lost him," the corpsman muttered.

"Let me look at him," Dr. Tom said.

While machine gun and mortar fire filled the air around him, Dr. Tom proceeded to massage the stopped heart of the "dead" 19-year-old Marine, and brought him back to life.

This was the kind of courage and medical skill Dr. Tom Viti displayed almost every day in our combat area around An Hoa, in Quang Nam Province, South Vietnam. Although he was the father of four small children, he had willingly accepted his call to military service. It was, he often said, his chance to repay the debt his Italian forebears owed this country. But when he arrived in Vietnam from his native New York City, his enthusiasm, as he frankly now

admits, was limited. "I thought I would serve my two years, forget Vietnam and return to my surgical residency at New Rochelle Hospital," he says. The plight of the Vietnamese people, in particular the children, changed his mind.

An Hoa in 1966 was a budding industrial complex located in "V.C. country" 20 miles southwest of Da Nang. It has a mixed population, some loyal to the government of South Vietnam, others loyal to the Viet Cong. Most of the people cooperated with the Viet Cong because they feared them. The Marines' situation was difficult. We had to make daily patrols into the countryside to keep the V.C. off guard. Almost invariably, these patrols cost us men. Most of our casualties were from booby traps. It was not unusual for Marines to die in booby trap explosions while civilians who knew of the weapon's deadly presence stood by in silence. Given the option of alerting the Marines and subsequently suffering torture or death at the hands of the V.C. or of remaining silent, they understandably chose to remain silent.

Six months after Dr. Viti's arrival, these same people were alerting Marines to the presence of booby traps even though the threats had lessened only slightly. This radical change can be directly attributed to the humanitarian efforts of Dr. Viti and the other members of the battalion medical team, Dr. "Flip" Gondor, M.D., Dr. Joe Donnelly, D.D.S., and their corpsmen.

A chance occurrence set off the chain of events which ultimately shifted the civilians' allegiance from the V.C. to the Marines. Some 2,300 inhabitants of a valley 10 miles south of An Hoa joined a Marine unit as it was about to return to base and requested asylum. The elders gave as their reason the fact that the V.C. had levied a 75 percent tax on their rice crop and had forcibly inducted all the valley's young men over the age of 13. Those who resisted were killed. "It was difficult to leave the graves of one's ancestors unattended," they said, "but one could no longer bear the yoke of communist rule."

Taken to District Headquarters next to the Marines' combat base, they were graciously received by the District Chief, Major Ham. The resultant housing shortage was quickly alleviated by the Marines and Seabees, while food was supplied by USAID.

Medical help, however, was another story. The Vietnamese had no doctors and only one nurse. The German Red Cross had a clinic in the area but their doctor—a gracious lady and authentic baroness—could not handle the Multitudes flocking to her clinic each day. Dr. Viti and the battalion medical team immediately came to her aid. The three M.D.s would often treat 500 persons a day while Dr. Donnelly pulled 250 rotting teeth. Their efforts quickly produced more patients as Vietnamese came from miles around to be treated by the American "Bacsi" (Vietnamese for doctor).

Then came the inevitable Viet Cong reaction. Seeing their hold on the civilian populace begin to slip, the V.C. made Dr. Viti "Public Enemy No. 1" and put a price on his head. They threatened reprisals and posted circulars in every hamlet. One mother who chose to ignore the threat and seek aid for her dying baby was killed with her husband and four other children on the night she returned home.

Medical supplies ran short. Additional requests for asylum raised the population to over 20,000. Refugee requests for aid for family members too sick to move from their

hamlets doubled monthly. A lesser man would have turned from these problems. Dr. Viti just solved them all.

Price on his head or not, Dr. Tom traveled daily into the surrounding villages. While accompanying the battalion on patrols deep into enemy territory he would aid women and children we all knew might be the family of a V.C. Once he found a young girl suffering from spinal meningitis. He brought her back to An Hoa, cured her and returned her home. Immediately the price was taken off his head. She was the daughter of the V.C. District Chief. The V.C. threats of violence soon lost their desired effect when it became obvious that the civilians, without the V.C. could not hope to survive, would rather face death than have one of their children die of a disease which the Bacsi could cure.

Dr. Tom wrote to the staff at St. Albans Hospital in Yonkers, New York and to numerous drug firms. He soon received medical supplies worth thousands of dollars, particularly immunizations for the children. The problem of numbers he solved by opening a clinic that included an operating theater fashioned from a partially destroyed amphibious tractor.

At nights when the V.C. shelled the combat base, he gathered his young patients in the tractor where the Vietnamese nurses in training told them stories. Then he opened three clinics far from the combat base protected by Marine Combat Action Platoons, i.e., a Marine squad plus a corpsman who led three squads of Popular Force soldiers to provide hamlet security. By using these outlying clinics as bases of operations, he could minister to those too sick to travel.

Thus word of Dr. Tom's humanitarian exploits continued to spread, casual things began to happen. The incidence of booby trap casualties began to drop, V.C. and North Vietnamese Army movements were brought to light by people he had aided, and most significantly, the rural populace began to understand that the Americans had come to help and not to colonize them.

While running this medical revolution, Dr. Viti continued to fight a very nasty war. More than a hundred Marines were killed around An Hoa during this period. He saved at least that many by constantly putting the lives of the wounded ahead of his own safety.

After almost 8 months in the field, Dr. Tom was given an opportunity to leave An Hoa for the relative safety of the First Marine Division Headquarters. He declined. "I'd rather ride a helicopter into a hot zone than fly a rear area desk any time," he said. A few days later, he "borrowed" General Foster C. LaHue's helicopter and flew into one of the heaviest actions of the year.

Finally, in December 1967, Dr. Tom's two years' service was almost over and he was reassigned to St. Albans Naval Hospital in New York. He did not, however, forget Vietnam. No sooner had he arrived home than he began a continuing campaign to raise funds for his clinic.

Dismayed by the average American's distorted view of the Vietnamese war, he attempted unsuccessfully to give an opposing view. He soon found out that a doctor who believed in what he had done in Vietnam was just not news. He also found out that his views on service to one's country were not shared by all of his fellow doctors. One, an orthopedic surgeon, who had just prepared the stump of a Marine's leg for an artificial limb, complained to Dr. Viti that he would have earned \$2,000 for that operation

if he hadn't been drafted. Dr. Tom suggested a first-hand visit to Vietnam before making any more such rash statements.

As would be expected, the amputees at St. Albans were Dr. Tom's first concern. To overcome the psychological shock of a missing limb, he arranged parties for amputees who had only been operated on days before. Boyhood friends who owned restaurants in the Bronx, Jimmy Devine and Marty Gilligan, joined forces with their neighbors to welcome the wounded home.

In November 1968, Dr. Viti left the Navy, returned to New Rochelle Hospital and subsequently completed his residency requirements at Bellevue Medical Center. Today, Dr. Tom is busily engaged in building the private practice he recently opened in the Bronx. But Vietnam is not forgotten. In addition to his continuing drive for funds, clothing and medicines for the An Hoa clinic, he supports five Vietnamese orphans and a Vietnamese nurse who cares for them.

The eternal optimist, he feels that incidents like the September 1970 North Vietnamese raid against his clinic which killed eight of "his" children and wounded 30 others will not be repeated now that a cease fire is in effect.

It was this same type of optimism which carried him safely through our own mine field the night we returned from an operation and he found one of his patients missing. She had been in a sedative-induced deep sleep when we left the combat base and needed only rest to help her recover from an advanced case of dysentery. Her parents waited 24 hours and when she did not awaken assumed she was dead and buried her. Not 35 minutes later Dr. Tom knowingly took the most direct route to her hamlet, which happened to be through the mine field surrounding our combat base, uncovered her grave with his bare hands and attempted unsuccessfully to breathe life back into her. When later asked about the mine field, Dr. Viti said the issue was never in doubt. He knew he'd get through safely.

Regardless of the final outcome of the Vietnam War, some 50,000 Vietnamese treated by Dr. Tom and the battalion medical team will remember the Bacsi who was willing to risk his life to care for the sick whether the color of their skin be red, yellow, black or white. No matter how Vietnam is recorded in the history books, one thing will remain clear: Dr. Tom Viti won his war for the hearts and minds of the people of An Hoa!●

THE NUCLEAR RESOLUTIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 14, 1982 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE NUCLEAR RESOLUTIONS

One of the most surprising political developments so far in 1982 has been the sudden increase in public concern about the growth of nuclear arsenals in the United States and the Soviet Union. Localities across the land have passed resolutions calling for an immediate end to the arms race and for a new arms control accord. Members of Congress

have introduced resolutions for the same purpose. President Reagan recently opened a news conference with remarks intended to slow the momentum of a congressional initiative calling for a freeze on nuclear arsenals. The national news media have covered the developments thoroughly and have even promoted them in some instances. Public opinion polls show a heavy majority of Americans favoring a freeze on nuclear weapons.

Several factors have converged to raise concern about the possibility of nuclear war and to create the demand for reductions in nuclear arsenals. The second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was never ratified by the United States Senate and was not supported by candidate Ronald Reagan, who after his election chose tacitly to abide by the treaty's terms. Although he has indicated an interest in doing so, the President has not resumed negotiations on strategic weapons with the Soviet Union. His military budget contains major increases for strategic forces. Also, cutbacks in social programs and record budget deficits have focused attention on the growth of the military budget. In Europe, demonstrations against nuclear weapons brought pressure to bear on political leaders there for a more vigorous effort to control arms. The Reagan Administration is widely seen as having failed to take the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms seriously.

A number of proposals to freeze or reduce the nuclear arsenals of both superpowers have been made. The President has proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union eliminate certain European theater nuclear forces entirely. The Soviet Union has suggested staged reductions in intermediate-range missiles to 300 for each side, with a moratorium on further deployment of these missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union as an act of good faith. One congressional resolution calls for a freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of nuclear weapons as an immediate objective of strategic arms control. It also calls on the two superpowers to work to cut the size of their nuclear arsenals. Another such resolution, considered a counter to the first one, calls on the President to propose to the Soviet Union a freeze at equal and reduced levels, leaving room for modernization of America's nuclear deterrent.

These resolutions bring several thoughts to mind.

First, we must acknowledge the legitimacy of people's anxiety about nuclear war. It is no exaggeration to say that many people are very frightened—for good cause. They are concerned about the survival of life on earth. They are right to demand that we get on with the task of arms control.

Second, the two main resolutions under consideration in Congress have common features: They assert the dangers of nuclear war, seek deep cuts in nuclear arsenals, accept negotiation as the best method of achieving mutual cuts, and demand verification of any agreements. However, the one resolution would halt and then reverse the arms race while the other would allow the United States to match the Soviet strategic buildup prior to a freeze. Despite their similarities, these resolutions do not lend themselves to compromise.

Third, I consider the value of the initial freeze resolution to be primarily symbolic. Debate on it can educate all of us and help push the nation forcefully toward arms control as an integral element of our policy of

national security. The passage of such a resolution would send a useful signal to the world that we are interested in arms control.

Fourth, this resolution has great appeal in a world which madly builds more and more nuclear arms as it careens toward nuclear holocaust. However, it is not a substitute for specific arms control negotiations or specific development of military capability, whether conventional or strategic.

Fifth, there are some very real problems with the resolution. For example, a freeze at present levels would lock the United States into certain military disadvantages. It would require extensive on-site inspection, something the Soviet Union has traditionally rejected. It would not allow us to modernize our strategic forces and thus might undercut our bargaining position.

Sixth, some opponents of the freeze argue that the United States has fallen behind in the arms race and needs to catch up. This argument is a serious one which must be considered carefully, but I am not persuaded by it at the present time. It is true that the West is behind in intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, that the Soviet Union could probably destroy many of our land-based ballistic missiles in a pre-emptive strike, and that the American strategic position is relatively weaker than it was ten years ago. However, it is also true that the United States is ahead in the number of strategic warheads it fields and in the capabilities of its nuclear submarines, of the ballistic missiles they carry, and of its strategic bombers. The balance is one of "essential equivalence" (as President Carter described it) or "rough parity" (as President Ford called it). No one really knows what will happen if these nuclear weapons are used. That uncertainty is one on the principal ingredients of deterrence.

The most pressing tasks before us are to reopen talks with the Soviet Union leading to control of strategic nuclear forces, to pursue energetically the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, and to start discussions on limitation of short-range nuclear forces.●

SUPERINTENDENT BURTIS E. TAYLOR RETIRING

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Burtis E. Taylor, superintendent of Glendale Unified and Community College Districts, Glendale, Calif., will retire on June 30, 1982, after more than four decades of dedication and devotion to public education.

For the past 14 years, Dr. Taylor has been the superintendent of public instruction in Glendale. Prior to that, he held the same position with the Arcadia Unified School District.

Throughout his outstanding career, his work in education has been respected and applauded. He has been a leader and an innovator in the field of education. He has been and will remain an admired member of the education community and the city in which he lives.

Dr. Taylor will be feted at a community reception on May 14 at Glendale Community College and at a dinner on June 4 at the Huntington Sheraton Hotel in Pasadena, Calif.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to offer my grateful thanks to Dr. Taylor for all the benefits his labors have brought to our community, our State, and country.

I want to wish him as much success in retirement as he experienced throughout his career. I am pleased to have this opportunity to honor a unique and gifted educator and a fine gentleman.●

WORLD BANK PRESIDENT ADDRESSES NEED FOR MORE AID TO AFRICA

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the World Bank, Mr. A. W. Clausen, spoke in Lagos before the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.

His remarks focused needed attention on the serious problems facing Africa—the legacy of two decades of declining food production, and projections of scant growth in per capita income during the 1980's.

Under his leadership, the World Bank has called for the doubling of assistance to sub-Saharan Africa in this decade. I share his view that greater commitment is necessary, as the developed world has not directed an equitable share of foreign assistance, resources, or technology to African nations. Less than 10 percent of U.S. aid last year was directed to the enormous problems in Africa, and this amount is clearly insufficient in consideration of our extensive national security, mineral, and trade interests with the continent.

Mr. Clausen's remarks present a frank, yet hopeful assessment of Africa's problems and potential. I would like to share the text of his remarks which address what the World Bank and nations, such as ours, must do to meet our responsibilities in this important effort.

THE CHALLENGE OF DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

(By A. W. Clausen, President The World Bank)

Mr. Minister, Mr. Director General, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a great pleasure to be invited here, and to have the opportunity of exploring with you this evening some of the facets of our close partnership in The World Bank with our developing member countries here in Sub-Saharan Africa.

It is important to stress at the very outset that the Bank is determined to become a

still more effective development agency. A key and central aim for the Bank is the alleviation of poverty. Our objective in any developing country—anywhere in the world—is precisely the same: to assist the country both to accelerate its economic growth and to reduce its level of domestic poverty by enhancing the productivity of its poor, and thus making possible a better standard of living for all its people.

The challenge that you are facing are thorny and difficult, and we in the Bank have made it a top priority to do all that we can to assist you in your effort to solve them.

Nigeria is a major factor in the region. It accounts for roughly a quarter of the total population of Sub-Saharan Africa, and for an investment level that represents more than 60 percent of the regional total.

The Bank is concerned about development in Sub-Saharan Africa. We are determined to do everything we can to assist Sub-Saharan countries in their development plans—on a priority basis—because this is the one major region in the developing world in which almost all of the countries therein (18 to be exact), actually suffered a decline in income per capita during the 1970s. That decline—and all the hardship it involves for the peoples of the region—is obviously unacceptable to the countries involved. It's also unacceptable to the Bank, and, indeed, ought to be equally unacceptable to the international community as a whole.

But more disquieting still—are projections by The World Bank's researchers that point to scant growth in per capita income in the majority of the countries of this area in the 1980s. This implies an absolute worsening of circumstances for millions of Africans in the years ahead.

That outlook simply must be improved. And it can be improved. It can be improved through better global economic conditions, through greater development assistance to Africa, through some new policy initiatives by some of the governments here, and by a greater involvement in this region by The World Bank. That greater involvement will demand a new era of more intense partnership between the peoples of Africa and the Bank.

Certainly The World Bank will do all it can to secure this new and more productive era of partnership.

Let us examine briefly each of these elements, which together can promote brighter prospects for Sub-Saharan Africa, and begin by touching on some of the factors that have to be taken into account if the dimensions of the challenge ahead are to be fully grasped.

The economic crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa is particularly evident in the agricultural sector. During the past two decades, food production has grown at barely more than half the pace of population growth. Average nutrition levels have fallen, even with increased food imports. And export crop production has stagnated.

The deterioration in agriculture has been compounded by both external and internal factors. Many countries have been confronted with severe balance of payments difficulties, and the quality of life for millions of the poor on the continent has been eroded.

And there are other alarming data that bring into sharp focus the critical difficulties that grip so much of the continent. Death rates in Sub-Saharan Africa are the highest in the world. And life expectancy, at just 47 years on average, is the lowest. One

out of every 5 or 6 children dies before its first birthday.

In the fall of 1979, the African Governors of The World Bank requested the Bank to prepare a special report on the economic development problems of the region, and this report, "Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa—An Agenda For Action" was discussed just a few weeks ago at a meeting of African government Ministers in Dakar. The Bank's report had benefited from the earlier analysis contained in the "Lagos Plan of Action" that was adopted just two years ago by the leaders of the Organization of African Unity.

The Bank's report has elicited a wide variety of views on the causes and solutions of the problems of the area, and the meeting in Dakar was particularly instructive. We in the Bank have listened very carefully to the full range of opinion, and we recognize that we have much to learn. But we have been struck, as well, by the broad areas of agreement that exist concerning the fundamental causes of the problems that face the region.

Climate, history, and geography, have all shaped and influenced the problems that confront countries in Africa today. Problems, for example, of shortages in trained manpower, of inadequate technology, and of poor soil quality continue to hamper the progress of many societies in the region.

Further, domestic economic difficulties have been exacerbated by global trends and events beyond the control of the peoples of Africa. Persistent inflation, unemployment, recession and other problems in the industrial nations have added to the difficulties of many developing nations. There has been, for example, a major deterioration in the export prices of many countries in the Sub-Saharan region. And not even the oil exporters, as Nigeria now is finding, have been immune from the consequences of these economic setbacks.

We are acutely aware of the impact that external shocks and trends are having on the prospects for Sub-Saharan Africa. We are aware, too, of the dangers for all developing countries that could lie ahead if the industrial nations do not succeed in extricating themselves from the array of complicated economic difficulties that now enmesh them.

But together with the historical, geographical, and the external problems Sub-Saharan Africa has had to face, there have been some difficulties arising out of domestic policies as well.

Both the "Lagos Plan of Action" and the Bank's report stress, for example, the need to accelerate domestic food output. Your government has made this a priority objective. But we recognize that there are complex problems to be overcome.

Poor soil, together with unfavorable climatic conditions, have been a factor in some areas. And the most efficient technologies have not always been as available as they may be elsewhere. But the fact remains that the internal policies of various governments in the region are an important factor in the levels of domestic food production. And that, of course, is true of any country in the world, even the most advanced.

The relevance of sound domestic policies applies both to the production of food crops and cash crops. There has been some debate about the relative importance to be attached to the two. But, in general, The World Bank's experience over many years with scores of agricultural projects demonstrates that countries that have policies resulting in adequate and fair incentives and

assistance to farmers, through the public and the private sectors, are the ones that do best with both food and cash crops.

In contrast, too many countries have pursued policies in the food crop sector that have sought to keep prices paid to farmers artificially low in order to provide cheap food for the cities. But such an approach does not help achieve the goal of food self-sufficiency.

Low prices paid to farmers have sometimes resulted from over-valued exchange rates—policies that discriminate indirectly against farmers—and sometimes from direct regulation of prices. Such approaches have spawned inefficiencies. Sometimes, too, the institutions involved in regulation and distribution have been inefficient.

Agriculture is a key sector, both because of its importance in improving the lot of the poor, and in providing the basis for growth in other segments of the economy. But as both the "Lagos Plan of Action" and the Bank's Africa report note, development in the Sub-Saharan region will require progress across a wide range of sectors, including industry, transport, energy, and human resources. The World Bank fully recognizes the need for a multi-sectoral approach, and will continue to support it in its lending programs and related analytic work.

Without doubt there are instances where better results could be produced if the public sector were to shoulder proportionately less of the burden. Experience demonstrates that sound business practices can lead to very successful results. But, of course, the private sector cannot do it all. The public sector has a very vital role to play as well.

The World Bank is concerned with promoting the most efficient and the most productive use of scarce development resources. It is not concerned with the issues of ownership or control. In Africa, as elsewhere, the Bank has made, and will continue to make, effective loans to public sector enterprises—in agriculture, and in industry, and in other sectors.

The Bank will continue to support greater efficiency in the public sector, and to concentrate scarce financial and human resources on key development tasks. And where possible we will try to help governments harness the energies of the private sector. The indigenous, organized private sector is underdeveloped in many African nations today. It will take time, and government encouragement, for private entrepreneurship to take hold and to gather strength.

There is, of course, a danger in all of this of over generalization. No single development strategy works best everywhere. And no one nation's problems are ever identical to those of all other nations.

At The World Bank our approaches will remain flexible, and our assistance will be tailored to the specific needs of each of our member countries.

If, then, the prospects for Sub-Saharan Africa are to be brighter, it is clear that there must be both a healthier external environment and, in a number of instances, new domestic policy initiatives. Now, it often is very difficult for governments to effect such policy changes, and it is going to require vision, and statemanship, and genuine political courage for them to introduce and implement new approaches.

The World Bank will help in every way it can to support this effort, and to strengthen the prospects for greater prosperity in Africa. The Bank wants to help raise the

living standards of Africans—of all Africans. The Bank has not changed its focus on poverty in its operations. The reduction—and ultimately the elimination—of absolute poverty remains a fundamental priority for The World Bank.

Last September, at the annual meeting of the Bank's Board of Governors, the Bank called for a doubling of aid to Africa during this decade. And we reiterate that call today. All the developed nations need to bolster their efforts to assist this continent to enter more fully into the mainstream of global economic growth.

Clearly, the Bank's ability to help Africa depends to a great degree on the volume of funds available to us. There are dark clouds gathering now on the issue of concessional aid. The economic problems in the industrial nations have resulted in budgetary constraints, and these are having an adverse effect on the International Development Association—the World Bank affiliate that provides efficient development finance to its poorest member countries on concessional terms. In relation, however, to the overall size of the budgets of the industrial nations, the IDA contributions are miniscule. It is urgent that IDA be fully funded.

Contributions to IDA have fallen far short of expectations in this fiscal year. International agreements called for contributions that would have provided for a \$4.1 billion IDA program for the 12 month period ending on June 30, 1982.

By early April it appeared that the shortfall in IDA contributions for the current fiscal year would amount to fully \$1.5 billion. This would force an overall cut in the IDA program of 37 percent. Even in this situation, we proposed to limit the projected cut to less than half of that—to a maximum of 18 percent—for the Sub-Saharan region.

In recent days, however, a number of nations have agreed to stronger IDA funding. Next month in Helsinki, Ministers of Finance from many nations will meet to discuss the global economic situation. I am hopeful of still further progress on the IDA funding front at the Development Committee meeting. But even at best, it is unrealistic to expect that a shortfall in IDA will not continue to exist in the coming months.

The overall situation is serious. There is no question that the donor governments should meet their agreed-upon international commitments to IDA. It is tragic that the poor countries should suffer because of a disagreement among the affluent nations over burden-sharing. And it is deeply unfortunate that at the very time when there is a genuine need to expand IDA programs in Sub-Saharan Africa, we have been forced to cut them back.

The Bank is doing all it can to secure more realistic, larger, IDA levels—and it counts on Africa's support in this. Further, through consultative groups, and bilateral aid agencies, the Bank will attempt to mobilize additional co-financing, on suitable terms, for priority projects in the Sub-Saharan region. We are moving right now to establish new consultative groups for Sub-Saharan Africa.

And beyond that, the Bank will work to secure greater overall assistance for Africa. There ought to be stronger support for the African Development Bank, and for the various bilateral programs for this continent.

Our own World Bank affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, is right now in the process of strengthening its African programs. IFC lends to, and takes equity in, private sector projects that have a high de-

velopment component. In fiscal year 1981, IFC's investments south of the Sahara amounted to more than \$100 million, almost double the previous year's total. This in turn has served as a catalyst for investments with a total value of nearly \$700 million. A dozen nations were involved and IFC invested for the first time in Burundi, Congo, Somalia, and Zimbabwe.

We are going to strengthen, too, our analytical work in partnership with the nations that borrow from the Bank. The leaders of these countries have stressed to us how valuable they find the policy analysis undertaken by the Bank. We need to do more of this. And as Africa is now a key priority for us, we have just transferred more than a dozen economists and technical specialists to our operations departments concerned with East and West Africa, drawing them from other units of the Bank. This underscores our commitment.

In short, ladies and gentlemen, we in The World Bank are seeking to establish a genuine dialogue with the leaders of Africa, a real partnership. No fundamental, long-term program can possibly succeed unless it is supported widely in the nations where it is to be implemented. We will give governments all the support we can in the difficult tasks that confront them.

Now, before concluding, let me make a few specific remarks about Nigeria. This country is in many respects unique; its political structure, and its economic importance as a major oil producer and exporter make it special.

Yet Nigeria has to grapple with many of the same problems as the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa. The productive base needs strengthening; morbidity and mortality are still severe; and the levels of nutrition, health, and education need bolstering.

As in most African states, Nigeria's leaders are faced with difficult policy decisions regarding the production base of the economy. In the longer term, the nation's oil resources are limited, and exportable oil surpluses are expected to fall significantly after 1990. And already, now, the slack in the international oil market in recent months is having an adverse impact, with 1981 oil revenues declining by about \$8 billion and no improvement thus far in 1982. Certainly the immediate problems of the Nigerian economy are very serious indeed.

These developments underscore the importance of adopting an appropriate set of policies in order to bring about a structural change while oil still provides a degree of flexibility which most other nations in the region lack. The Fourth Plan sets the right tone and direction in this matter, and the Government's emphasis on industry and agriculture—especially food production—give it substance.

In the short term, the problems the nation is dealing with are burdensome, and complicate even further the already difficult longer term decisions the government faces. These are hard times for Nigeria, with oil revenues sharply down just at the time of the launching of the ambitious investment program of the Fourth Plan.

But let me assure you that despite these circumstances, The World Bank recognizes that Nigeria's long-term development and financial prospects are fundamentally sound. We intend to continue to provide substantial assistance to Nigeria, and to help it, through additional cofinancing, greater IFC involvement, and through other means, to raise more external capital. We have every confidence in Nigeria's productive potential,

and we feel sure that—given sound policies—it will come through the present crisis satisfactorily, and be able to refocus its efforts on achieving long-term structural change.

If one looks objectively at the evolving relationship between The World Bank and its developing member countries, it is clear that a great deal has been accomplished over the past 36 years. In the years to come, we must build on that experience. We must strive for a still stronger partnership in order to meet and overcome the continuing challenges of poverty and development.

The task, to be sure, is enormous. But the rewards can be very great as well. If living conditions on our planet are to be more secure and more stable, then surely every effort must be made to insure more promising economic prospects for all.

Helping to bring about that brighter economic outlook for Sub-Saharan Africa is a key World Bank priority. And for whatever that requires—and for however long it takes—The World Bank, as a partner, is going to be here, assisting the countries of the region to achieve their critical development goals.

We're immensely proud to be associated with you, and all the peoples of Sub-Saharan Africa, in this great effort. And you can fully count on us to stay the course with you.

Thank you very much.●

THE LUXURY TAX ACT OF 1982

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to place a 15-percent tax on luxury goods. The tax would only be paid for items that are true luxuries. It covers such items as jewelry, watches, clothing (including furs), cars, boats, airline tickets, meals, and hotel rooms. However, it is designed so that the average person would never or rarely pay the tax.

For each category, there is a simple exemption from the tax that would cover the sale of those items within each category which are not luxuries. For watches and jewelry, the exemption is \$100. Thus, if you bought a watch for \$100 or less, there would be no tax. However, if you bought the watch advertised in the New York Times for \$3,450 then you would pay \$502 in taxes. Anyone who would pay that much for a watch can easily afford to pay the tax. Those who can most afford to pay a tax would be paying this one. Those who are having some difficulty making ends meet would never be burdened with it.

Frankly, I believe that most people who buy the items that would be taxed would not change their buying habits. Their income levels are such that it would make little difference to them. To some extent, it has been argued by some economists that a tax on "status goods" actually improves

their utility. Since the value of the status item improves with the amount that has to be paid for it, the tax only creates a burden equal to the added value.

To the extent that the tax would reduce the amount of luxuries purchased, the effect would be, to a large extent, to increase investment. In theory, that was the reason that the wealthy were given such generous tax reductions in the 1981 Tax Act.

The average taxpayer received a 1 1/4-percent reduction in 1981. For 1981 and 1982 combined, the average taxpayer's reduction in rates was 10 percent. For those in the highest bracket, the rates went down from 70 to 50 percent. That is a decrease of 28 percent. The maximum tax on long-term capital gains fell to 20 percent, also a 28-percent reduction. Further, while the average taxpayer lost out to inflation without any adjustment in the "zero bracket amount" and the personal exemptions, these provisions have comparatively little effect on those with high incomes.

This luxury tax would have two effects. Some of the generous tax reductions of the 1981 Tax Act would be returned to the Treasury when luxuries are purchased. Second, it would, to some extent, increase the incentive to invest one's income.

WHAT WOULD BE TAXED

The tax would be 15 percent of the retail price actually paid above the indicated threshold for the following items:

	Exemption amount
Jewelry, watches.....	\$100
Clothing.....	150
Automobiles.....	15,000
Recreational boats.....	5,000
Air transportation.....	(1)
Hotel rooms (per day).....	100
Meals (per meal).....	25

¹ Regular coach fare amount.

The Treasury would of course have to create rules to carefully define a single item subject to a single exemption. Clearly, a diamond ring could not be counted as four separate pieces—three separate diamonds and a setting. The bill does define certain specific cases. For example, earrings sold separately would only receive half of the exemption. Also, all items added to a car or boat within 30 days of the sale by the dealer would be included as part of the sale price.

To those who might say, "But the auto industry is in serious trouble; this would be an added weight," I would suggest that the weight would not be seriously felt. The number of cars made by the big three that sell for over \$15,000, where the tax is first applied, is relatively few. If a car cost \$17,000, the tax would come to \$300, or less than 2 percent of the price—hardly a decisionmaking difference. As we go to the truly luxurious cars that

might cost \$30,000, then the tax would climb to a more substantial \$2,250, or 7.5 percent.

We are facing budget deficits in excess of \$100 billion. In large part, that deficit is caused by a tax cut which was exceedingly generous to those in the highest tax brackets. This tax will not balance the budget. However, it will help to close the gap. It will also provide some needed equity to the tax system.●

RATIFICATION OF SALT II AS AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will shortly introduce a House joint resolution ratifying SALT II as an executive agreement. Before doing so, I will now review the compatibility of this procedure with the Constitution and rules of the United States, and with the rules and procedures of the Congress.

Ratification of SALT II is, by precedent, compatible with all of these. Both the annexation of Texas as a State and the annexation of Hawaii as a territory were first negotiated as treaties, and then these treaties were ratified as executive agreements by majority votes in both Houses rather than by two-thirds of the Senate. There is also a relevant precedent in the ratification of the SALT I offensive limitations as an executive agreement.

I have asked the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to examine these questions in detail, and I now insert the Division's analysis and conclusions.

PRECEDENTS SUPPORTING THE USE OF A CONGRESSIONAL JOINT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE 1979 STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TREATY (SALT II) AS AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

(By David M. Sale, legislative attorney, American Law Division, Apr. 2, 1982)

The purpose of this general report is to identify and assess legal precedents which could be cited as supporting authority for the use of a Congressional Joint Resolution to approve the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II), United States-Soviet Union, signed June 18, 1979, S. Exec. Y, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. (1979), as an executive agreement. The SALT II treaty, which was submitted to the Senate for consent on June 22, 1979, was set aside by the Senate pursuant to Presidential request following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.

Any current effort to effect United States domestic adherence to the SALT II treaty by means of a Joint Resolution approved by both Houses of Congress and the President would involve the use of an alternative procedure to that otherwise specified in Article II, Sec. 2, Cl. 2, of the Constitution. The foregoing provision indicates that "The

President . . . shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. . . ." It is now well established, of course, that the treaty procedure authorized by Article II is not the exclusive mode of international agreement-making under the Constitution, *Field v. Clark*, 143 U.S. 649 (1892); *Starkist Foods, Inc. v. United States*, 169 F. Supp. 268 (1958), *aff'd* 275 F.2d 472 (1959); *United States v. Belmont*, 301 U.S. 324 (1937); and *United States v. Pink*, 315 U.S. 203 (1942). See generally W. McClure, "International Executive Agreements" (1941); McDougal and Lans, "Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements: Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy," 54 Yale L.J. 181, 534 (1945); L. Henkin, "Foreign Affairs and the Constitution" (1972), Chap. VI.

In United States practice, the alternative legal instrument resulting from the nonuse of the treaty procedure is commonly denominated an "executive agreement." Where an executive agreement is sanctioned by the joint authority of the Legislative and Executive branches, it may be termed a "Congressional-Executive agreement," as opposed to "Presidential" or "sole" executive agreements concluded by the President on his independent constitutional authority, or as opposed to agreements concluded pursuant to existing treaty authority.

For purposes of identifying and assessing precedents which might support the use of a Congressional Joint Resolution to effect domestic approval of the SALT II Treaty in executive agreement form, United States practice concerning Congressional-Executive agreements seems immediately relevant. In this regard, it may be noted generally that Congressional Joint Resolutions have been utilized in the past in conjunction with international agreements to authorize participation by the United States in various international organizations. See, for example, S.J. Res. 131, June 19, 1934, 48 Stat. 1182 (International Labor Organization); H.J. Res. 192, March 28, 1944, 58 Stat. 122 (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization); S.J. Res. 77, July 1, 1947, 61 Stat. 214 (International Refugee Organization); H.J. Res. 145, July 31, 1945, 59 Stat. 529 (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization); H.J. Res. 305, July 30, 1946, 60 Stat. 712 (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization); S.J. Res. 98, June 14, 1948, 62 Stat. 441 (World Health Organization).

Perhaps more directly germane to the issue at hand, however, is the utilization of the Congressional Joint Resolution procedure in connection with the Nation's acquisition of Texas and the Hawaiian Islands in 1845 and 1898 respectively. Following Senate rejection of an 1844 treaty of annexation, Congress adopted a Joint Resolution of March 1, 1845, 5 Stat. 797, consenting to the admission of Texas into the Union upon specified conditions. The annexation was accepted by Texas pursuant to a Joint Resolution of the Congress of Texas, June 23, 1845, and an Ordinance of the Convention of Texas, July 4, 1845. See 4 H. Miller, "Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America" 691-92 (1931). Subsequently, by a Congressional Joint Resolution of December 29, 1845, 9 Stat. 108, Texas was admitted into the Union. See 4 Miller, *Treaties*, *supra* at 689-739; McDougal and Lans, *supra* at 263-64; and McClure, *supra* at 62-67.

Similarly, with Senate consent to an 1897 treaty of annexation having been deemed unlikely, Hawaii was acquired pursuant to a Congressional Joint Resolution of July 7, 1898, 30 Stat. 750, which expressly "accepted, ratified, and confirmed" Hawaii's prior consent to the annexation. In this instance the authorizing Joint Resolution was adopted while the 1897 treaty of annexation was pending in the Senate. See McDougal and Lans, *supra* at 266-67; McClure, *supra* at 67-68; and I J. B. Moore, "A Digest of International Law" 509-11 (509-11 (1906)).

It has been observed concerning both of these territorial acquisitions that as "there was an offer by one nation and a formal acceptance by the other, it is clear that an international agreement was consummated." McDougal and Lans, *supra* at 266-67. See also I H. Miller, *Treaties*, *supra* at 8, where it is stated that "[t]he form by which [territorial] acquisition is achieved is quite immaterial. It may be by an international agreement which is not in any technical sense or even in any popular sense a treaty. The incorporation into the Union of the independent State of Texas resulted from the acceptance by a convention of Texas of an offer contained in a joint resolution of Congress of March 1, 1854. And it was by a joint resolution of Congress of July 7, 1898, that the offer of cession of the Hawaiian Islands was 'accepted, ratified, and confirmed.' In each case there was an international agreement...."

Subsequently, although the issue was not squarely presented, the Supreme Court seemed implicitly to approve the by-passing of the Senate's treaty prerogatives with regard to both of the foregoing territorial annexations. Thus, concerning the admission of Texas into the Union, the Court stated in *Texas v. White*, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 700 (1868), that "the people of the new state were invested with all the rights, and became subject to all the responsibilities and duties of the original states under the Constitution," 74 U.S. at 722. Elsewhere, the Court indicated that "[t]he union between Texas and the other states was as complete, as perpetual, and as indissoluble as the union between the original states," 74 U.S. at 726.

Concerning the annexation of Hawaii, the Supreme Court indicated in *Hawaii v. Mankichi*, 190 U.S. 197 (1903), that the "status of the islands and the powers of their provisional government were measured by the [Congressional Joint Resolution]," 190 U.S. at 218 (emphasis original). Concurring opinions in the case declared that "the islands were undoubtedly made a part of the United States in the fullest sense . . .," 190 U.S. at 220.

The foregoing statements by the Supreme Court in the *Texas* and *Hawaii* cases would seem to assume the threshold constitutional validity of the Congressional-Executive agreement procedure which was utilized to effect these territorial annexations. Apart from these two cases, and other court decisions which more explicitly sustain the validity of Congressional-Executive agreements, such as *Field v. Clark*, and *Starkist Foods, Inc. v. United States*, cited *supra*, there are additional cases which, in deeming Congressional-Executive agreements to be "treaties" for purposes of specific federal statutes, further suggest the general domestic interchangeability of these two modes of international agreement-making. See *B. Altman & Co. v. United States*, 224 U.S. 583 (1912), and *Weinberger v. Rossi*, U.S. Sup. Ct., No. 80-1924, March 31, 1982. Cf. *Louis*

Wolf & Co. v. United States, 107 F.2d 819 (1939).

It may be noted that, apart from the *Texas* and *Hawaii* cases, the existing case law regarding Congressional-Executive agreements does not appear to involve agreements spawned subsequently to an actual or prospective failure of the Senate to consent to a treaty concerning the same subject matter. Arguably, however, as developed more fully in the succeeding discussion, this factual distinction between the *Texas* and *Hawaii* case precedents and the main body of Congressional-Executive agreement case law would not seem to diminish the additional precedential value of the latter where an international agreement is domestically sanctioned by a subsequently, as opposed to previously, enacted statute.

Preliminarily, it seems that the domestic authority basis for a Congressional-Executive agreement is identical whether the agreement is authorized by a preexisting or subsequently enacted statute (i.e. in either case there is enactment of legislation by the majority vote of both Houses of Congress followed by the ultimate approbation of the President in signing the authorizing measure into public law). It seems reasonable to suggest, therefore, as a threshold matter, that if Congressional-Executive agreements sanctioned by subsequently adopted statutes require the exercise of the same domestic authority which has been judicially validated for Congressional-Executive agreements authorized by prior legislation, then it is arguably constitutionally immaterial whether a particular agreement is grounded on prior or subsequent statutory authority. Secondly, inasmuch as the courts have recognized the nonexclusiveness of the treaty mode of agreement-making under the Constitution, subsequent domestic approval of an international agreement in the form of a "Congressional-Executive agreement" would arguably seem theoretically permissible, notwithstanding that the instrument may have been originally submitted for Senate consent as a "treaty."

To be sure, the foregoing propositions may not be entirely free from doubt. It has been argued, for example, that "[w]hatever justification there may be for the executive agreement within its proper scope or for Congressional legislation within the authority of Congress, there is no constitutional warrant whatever for the suggestion that the President has an option to submit his compact either to the Senate as a treaty . . . or to the Congress for majority approval." Borchard, "Shall the Executive Agreement Replace the Treaty," 53 Yale L. Rev. 664, 671 (1944). The prevailing view, however, would appear to be that of Professor Henkin who indicates that "[n]either . . . Congresses nor Presidents nor courts have been troubled by . . . conceptual difficulties. Whatever their theoretical merits, it is now widely accepted that the Congressional-Executive agreement is a complete alternative to a treaty: the President can seek approval of any agreement by joint resolution of both Houses of Congress instead of two-thirds of the Senate only," L. Henkin, *supra* at 175. See also Murphy, "Treaties and International Agreements Other Than Treaties: Constitutional Allocation of Power and Responsibility Among the President, the House of Representatives, and the Senate," 23 Univ. of Kan. L. Rev. 221, 237 (1975), and Slonim, "Congressional-Executive Agreements," 14 Col. J. Transnat. 1 L. 434, 449 (1975).

On the basis of the foregoing discussion concerning the status of Congressional-Ex-

ecutive agreements in light of United States practice, federal case law, and scholarly opinion, there would appear to be precedential support for the general interchangeability of Congressional-Executive agreements with treaties. Arguably application of these authorities in the context of the presently unratified SALT II Treaty would be constitutionally appropriate.

In this regard, resort to a Congressional-Executive agreement to effect domestic approval of the seemingly indefinitely postponed SALT II Treaty seems substantially analogous, for constitutional purposes, to the *Texas* and *Hawaii* acquisition situation in which Congressional-Executive agreements were employed to secure domestic approval of treaty objects otherwise frustrated by the actual or prospective defeat of the treaty itself. Although, unlike the situation regarding the *Texas* and *Hawaii* territorial acquisitions, the political willingness of the Executive to acquiesce in the use of a Congressional-Executive agreement to effectuate the SALT II Treaty seems in abeyance, inasmuch as the treaty has been set aside pursuant to Presidential request, the constitutional authority of both Branches to join in utilizing this alternate form of domestic approval of the international agreement arguably remains potentially available on the basis of the *Texas* and *Hawaii* precedents and associated case law and scholarly community. Moreover, while perhaps not controlling on the issue, Congress appears to possess subject-matter competence in the arms control area pursuant to its constitutionally delegated powers to provide for the common defense, to raise and support an army, and to raise and maintain a navy (Art. I, Sec. 8, Cls. 1, 12, and 13).

Utilization of the Congressional-Executive agreement procedure to effectuate domestic acquiescence to the SALT II Treaty would also seem compatible with the text of Section 33 of the Area Control and Disarmament Act (ACDA), 22 U.S.C. 2573, which provides in relevant part that—

[N]o action shall be taken under this [Act] or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

There would appear to be some evidence in the legislative history of Section 33 of the ACDA, however, suggesting that the alternative approval procedure authorized by the statute in favor of "affirmative legislation" by the whole Congress was intended primarily as a curb upon potential unilateral Executive action in the arms control area rather than as a means of circumventing the Senate's treaty prerogative. See "To Amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act," Hearings Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 138-40 (1963) (Statement of Congressman Fountain). See also 107 Cong. Rec. 20308-20309 (1961) (Statement of Congressman Fountain). While caution may be appropriate, therefore, in construing Section 33 of the ACDA as additional authority for the Congress to bypass the treaty mode, Section 33 would not, in any event, seem to bar utilization of a Congressional-Executive agreement for purposes of approving the SALT II Treaty where Congress is otherwise deemed constitutionally competent to employ this alternate procedure.

In conclusion, therefore, on the basis of actual practice under the Constitution concerning Congressional-Executive agreements, relevant judicial decisions, and scholarly opinion, a reasonable legal case could seemingly be made supporting the constitutionality of the use of a Congressional Joint Resolution to secure domestic approval of the pending SALT II Treaty as a Congressional-Executive agreement. While the legal issue may not be wholly free from doubt, it would appear that a decision to effectuate the SALT II Treaty as a Congressional-Executive agreement may ultimately involve controlling policy, as opposed to constitutional considerations.●

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, our country has been engaged in a process of redemption for its 35-year-old silence about the Holocaust. Congress acknowledged its moral commitment by establishing an office at the Justice Department to investigate and prosecute alleged former Nazi war criminals who entered this country illegally by lying about their wartime activities. Despite the lapse in time since those horrible crimes were committed, we have made surprising progress in bringing Nazi war criminals to justice.

Two years ago, to strengthen that moral commitment, Congress created the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council as a permanent part of our Government. I am privileged to be a member of the Council and one of its founding members. The Council's purpose is to make our citizens of all faiths aware of the unspeakable crimes perpetrated systematically, and officially, against the Jewish people and against humanity. In accordance with the establishment of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, which was signed into law in October of 1980, 1 week each year will be designated as the "Days of Remembrance" for the victims of the Holocaust and will be marked by a national, civic commemoration and by private and public observances around the country. This week of April 18-25, 1982, marks the second observance since this historic legislation was passed.

People forget, and some people deny that the Holocaust happened, even in the face of undeniable evidence. Just as the Nazis tried to erase the existence, the culture, and the history of Jews, there are those today who would try to erase that most painful of all memories. Today, continuing ignorance and bigotry compel us to keep that memory alive.

This remembrance is not only for the victims, but for the living. We, the living, must bear the responsibility of

insuring that no institution will ever again decide who shall and shall not have the right to live. The Holocaust has great significance for Americans. American soldiers liberated many of the camps and were the first witnesses of what the rest of the world, including our country, had ignored. Many of the survivors of the Holocaust finally immigrated to this country and many went to Israel.

Instead of monuments, the Holocaust survivors have stressed the importance of studying the lessons of the Holocaust. We must teach ourselves and others, Jews and non-Jews, to understand the unique and the universal implications of the annihilation of 6 million Jews, not as an accidental occurrence, but as a primary genocidal goal of the Nazis. We need to comprehend that and to apply that understanding to our lives.

To educate those coming after the Holocaust generation, and to continue the complex education and understanding by scholars and citizens, there are plans for a Holocaust museum, a living monument to all those who perished in the Holocaust. The museum, to be funded primarily by private contributions, is being planned with sensitivity and competence by people of different faiths, ethnic backgrounds, and experiences.

For those who ask why is all of this necessary so long after the Holocaust, the answer is that the Holocaust experience has changed human history. It affects us all. Only our awareness of that experience will help us prevent another Holocaust—not for Jews, or for gypsies, or for Christians, or Armenians, or Baha'is, or children, or the mentally disabled, or homosexuals, or political dissidents, or those of different color or race.

Last year, I attended a very special event. Under the Council's auspices, the first International Liberators' Conference took place in Washington. The liberated and their liberators met for the second time. To experience that meeting between those valiant free men who were the first to see the world of horror and those who had been its inhabitants stirred the deepest emotions that day. The testimony given from those who led the survivors out of the abyss and from those who had fought in the resistance should silence forever neo-Nazi lunacy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include here a moving excerpt from the welcoming address presented at that conference by the Honorable Elie Wiesel, the chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council:

EXCERPT FROM "MEETING AGAIN" BY ELIE WIESEL, CHAIRMAN, U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

To paraphrase Neitzsche, we looked deep into the Abyss—and the Abyss looked back at us. No one comes close to the kingdom of night and goes away unconcerned. We told

the tale—or, at least, we tried. We resisted all temptations to isolate ourselves and be silent. Instead we chose to affirm our desperate faith in testimony. We forced ourselves to speak—however inadequately, however poorly. We may have used the wrong words—but then there are no words to describe the ineffable. We spoke in spite of language, in spite of the limits that exist between what we say and outsiders hear. We spoke and . . . explosions in Paris, bombs in Antwerp, murderous attacks in Vienna. Is it conceivable that Nazism could dare come back into the open so soon—while we are still alive, while we are still here to denounce its poisonous nature as illustrated in Treblinka?

Again we must admit our naivete. We thought we had vanquished what Brecht called the beast, but no: it is still showing its claws. At best, what a gathering such as this could do is to shame the beast into hiding. If we here succeed—and I hope and pray that we shall—in rising above politics, above the usual recriminations between East and West, above simplistic propaganda, and simply tell the world what both liberators and liberated have seen, then something may happen; the world may choose to pay more attention to what hangs as threat to its very future.

If we succeed—and I hope and pray that we shall—in putting aside what divides us—and what divides us is superficial—if we dedicate ourselves not only to the memory of those who have suffered but to the future of those who are suffering today, we shall be serving notice on mankind that we shall never allow this earth to be made into a prison again, that we shall never allow war to be considered as a solution to any problem—for war is the problem. If we succeed, then our encounter will be recorded as yet another of our common victories.

If we do not raise our voice against war—who will? We speak with the authority of men and women who have seen war; we know what it is. We have seen the burnt villages, the devastated cities, the deserted homes, we still see the demented mothers whose children are being massacred before their eyes, we still follow the endless nocturnal processions to the flames rising up to the seventh heaven—if not higher . . .

We are gathered here to testify—together. Our tale is a tale of solitude and fear and anonymous death—but also of compassion, generosity, bravery and solidarity. Together, you the liberators and we the survivors represent a commitment to memory whose intensity will remain. In its name we shall continue to voice our concerns and our hopes not for our own sake, but for the sake of humankind its very survival may depend on its ability and willingness to listen.

And to remember.●

U.S. FINANCIAL SYSTEM THREATENED BY ADMINISTRATION, TREASURY SECRETARY, BIG MONEY INTERESTS

HON. JIM MATTOX

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, I

wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues some developments which threaten the very foundations of our national financial system.

The administration ostensibly is committed to New Federalism, to deregulation, to business competition, and to restoration of policymaking functions to the representatives of the people and away from unelected bureaucrats. These are laudable goals, with which few in Congress would quarrel. There is a lot of room for disagreement, however, and cause for concern in the very odd implementation of these objectives being urged upon us by the Secretary of the Treasury and his allies in Congress and the regulatory agencies.

According to the former head of Merrill Lynch, New Federalism is great, except when it allows the sovereign States to have a meaningful say in the structure of local financial institutions or how to protect local businesses and local economies from the predatory big money interests favored by the Secretary.

Their idea of deregulation is decimation of statutory safeguards which protect local economies and consumers and which have precluded the possibility of financial panics during the last five decades. They advocate destroying the dual banking system and replacing it with a single, all-powerful superagency to mirror and monitor the supermarkets of finance that the Treasury Secretary believes will rule our economy.

Competition, in this context, means setting community-based banks and thrifts at each other in deadly competition, while a relatively few money center institutions and nonbanking corporations gain even greater control of our entire national financial system.

As for the supposedly reined-in bureaucracy, it has been set loose and is now attempting to dictate congressional decisions, not just implement them, because Congress is not moving fast enough toward the Treasury Secretary's goal of a centralized plutocracy.

In sum, this administration, with the Treasury Secretary as tactical commander, is waging an undeclared war against the thousands of smaller depository institutions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is a harsh charge, but proof is on record. In fact, the Treasury Secretary has personally provided much of it. The war is undeclared, but the battle plan is clear. He has laid it out and elaborated upon it.

The Treasury Secretary began to clarify his intentions last fall. In a September 14 speech in Chicago, he sang loud praises to Citicorp, Continental Illinois, American Express, Sears and, last but not least in his heart, Merrill Lynch, citing them collectively as the modern corporations,

ready to face the changing conditions of our day.

He attacked the Glass-Steagall Act—Federal law which helps prevent financial system failure from an intermingling of commercial and investment banking.

He attacked the Home Owners Loan Act—landmark legislation largely responsible for these United States being the best housed Nation on Earth.

And he attacked the other laws and regulations which development out of the experience of the Great Crash and its resultant Great Depression, dismissing them with the simple pronouncement that "they don't make sense now."

The Treasury Secretary contends that national laws which require respect for the regulatory powers and needs of the individual States, real federalism, have "Balkanized our financial system into 42,000 depository institutions, including 15,000 commercial banks." According to the Secretary, these "artificial geographic constraints run counter to the nature of a modern financial services industry, * * * reduce competition among financial institutions and impair the industry's efficiency."

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Secretary is dead wrong. The State of Texas, for one, wishes to retain its ability to regulate its banking industry. Citicorp, Chase-Manhattan, and their ilk, may view our border as an artificial barrier, but Texans view it as a protection to help insure that deposits solicited from Texans benefit to meet the credit needs of Texas. Moreover, the large number of financial institutions vying for business, whose multiplicity so upsets the Secretary, in fact fosters and assured competition.

Perhaps the Treasury Secretary should take time to review his boss' state of the Union address. President Reagan called for a New Federalism to restore basic decisions to the States and provide clear, enforceable lines of accountability. The President spoke passionately of his belief that concentration of power at the national level is pervasive, intrusive, unmanageable, costlier, and unaccountable. The administration should resolve within itself the very different tacks it is taking in the realms of social and financial policies.

I suspect that the Secretary would contend that he has only the best interests of the little people at heart. In his Chicago speech, he lamented that "it is only the small business and household customers who continue to be deprived of the benefits of a competitive interstate banking system." That is another laudable sentiment, one which is, at best, misguided, and, at worst, false. The voters in my State want to patronize a bank with community roots, which will lend where its

deposits are made. Small businesses want to deal with bank officers with local interests.

The small business and household customers frankly do not care that Citicorp is itching to compete head-on with Merrill Lynch's cash management account, because most of them do not have the \$20,000 price of admission to play that game. What they do want is a safe place to put their savings, a reasonable rate of interest, and a fair chance to get a loan.

Mr. Speaker, in October the Treasury Secretary testified on Senator GARN's banking restructuring bill, S. 1720. That legislation is the noted Christmas tree bill, so labeled by the distinguished chairman of the House Banking Committee, Mr. ST GERMAIN. S. 1720 offers sops to the small financial institutions, such as allowing them to underwrite Government revenue bonds and offer money market funds, but with this minor relief the banks are asked to accept expansion in the powers of thrift institutions which would not only create a favored set of competitors, but begin a process which would destroy the basic tenets of our financial structure.

S. 1720 proposes no less than that thrift institutions be permitted to invest all of their assets in commercial, corporate, business, or agricultural loans. This expansion of powers could leave the Nation without any identifiable source for the bulk of its housing finance needs.

Not a single financial expert maintains that such expanded powers would be of any use to the thrifts in their current misery. Actually, given the greater degree of risk and necessary expertise for successful commercial lending, it is likely that many thrifts would get into worse trouble by extending unwise loans to those whom commercial banks have turned away.

Should this proposal be adopted, we would have two sets of financial institutions with comparable asset and liability powers but governed by different regulators, having differing access to Government credit, being taxed differently, required to meet different reserve requirements, and possessing different branching powers. Nevertheless, the Treasury Secretary pronounces it "appropriate, since our goal is to permit all depository institutions eventually to compete on equal terms."

The extension of these powers also would get State laws which differentiate between intrastate branching limits on banks and thrifts. Many States, including my own, permit thrifts to branch far beyond the limits proscribed for commercial banks. The States have sound reasons for such differences, but could not maintain such policies if thrifts have commercial banking powers.

That is no problem, according to the Treasury Secretary. He says:

It would be desirable if the State governments equalized the branching powers of all depository institutions under their jurisdictions and did so by liberalizing those powers to permit unrestricted intrastate branching. This would strengthen the State banking systems prior to any expansion of the interstate activities of depository institutions.

That is a candid admission of the special agenda of the Secretary and the big money center institutions and corporations he favors. In effect, the Secretary is saying: Forget New Federalism when it interferes with concentrating the power of our financial system. The States should throw out branching restrictions so out-of-State giants of finance will have an easier time of it when the Federal Government lets them take over local markets and economies.

The final result of broadened powers would be to erase the barriers between banking and commerce. Why? One reason is so financial giants can gain more power. Local institutions, businesses, and depositors and borrowers merely clutter up the giants' playing field. To the big money financiers, the sooner these insignificant factors are gotten rid of, the better. A second reason is that, in the aggregate, these local interests wrongfully control a significant amount of financial resources: to the giants, this is a crime against nature because only they should, and capably can, make all decisions affecting our national finance system. Of course, a third major reason for the Treasury Secretary and the interests he supports is that homogenizing financial institutions would allow giant corporations like Merrill Lynch, Sears, and so forth, to use the transition to legitimize the banking activities they already have.

The Treasury Secretary and his allies continue to maintain that S. 1720 is very modest and would not prejudice any debate on McFadden, Douglas, and the separation of banking from commerce. Just the opposite is true, and they know it. It would prejudice that debate before it really commenced. As Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker testified in the Senate:

If thrift powers are broadened to the extent envisaged, the logic would point to the need for substantial further changes in the law very promptly. Decisions will need to be made, for instance, about whether commercial banks or thrift branching powers should be the norm, whether we find it acceptable that industrial or commercial firms should operate subsidiaries with full banking powers, and whether banks, too, should be able to become real estate developers. Decisions on such issues could affect the safety, soundness and efficiency of our financial institutions.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury has endorsed legislation which would destroy the safety and soundness of our financial

system, to the detriment of the Nation and the benefit of a small number of plutocrats.

Further, the Treasury Department has a substitute for title III of S. 1720 which would change a modest entry into limited securities areas into a full-scale assault upon the Glass-Steagall Act's separation of commercial and investment banking.

Title III, as the Treasury would have it, would establish a vastly broadened definition of banking. In addition to underwriting municipal revenue bonds and offering money market funds, the Treasury's proposal would permit the marketing of mutual stock and bond funds, the underwriting and brokerage of insurance, and engaging in real estate development. It would permit bank holding companies to acquire shares of any company that offers financial services. Which financial services? The Treasury proposal says these services should be defined by the Federal Reserve within 180 days of enactment but, at the same time, would strip the Fed of any ability to determine which activities are closely related to and a proper incident of banking, when these activities are of a financial nature.

Instead, the Fed would be directed to base definitions not on experience and caution, but on what would maximize competition between banks and nonregulated financial firms.

What this adds up to, Mr. Speaker, is a situation in which Merrill Lynch's marketing department would, in effect, rewrite the definition of banking every time it develops some new service. And, as though stripping the Fed of any real discretion in defining banking is not foolhardy enough, Treasury would deny the Fed the power to examine the nonbank affiliates of a bank holding company, unless it make a prior finding that the condition of the affiliate could endanger the safety and soundness of the bank. Unless Fed officials are clairvoyant, they could not make a prior determination because they would be denied access to necessary information by the same law requiring them to make the determination.

Under the Treasury's proposal, the last remaining limits on bank holding company activities would be antitrust law, and I, for one, have not noted in the current Justice Department an sense of a strong commitment to the principle of preventing undue concentration.

Of course, the Securities and Exchange Commission would play a role in the oversight of these activities. That is not reassuring. We recently had evidence of the type of treatment money center banks could expect from the SEC when the Commission overruled the recommendation of its enforcement staff that a civil suit be brought against Citicorp. The compa-

ny, it seems, approved and carried out, for 7 years, a scheme which violated foreign exchange and tax laws and concealed the scheme with false and misleading reports. SEC officials argued no penalties should be sought because Citicorp has no legal duty to disclose its breaches of law because it had never represented to its shareholders that its management had honesty and integrity.

We have reached a sad day in America, Mr. Speaker, when a primary Federal business policing agency says dishonesty is the norm which shareholders and citizens should expect for corporate management. Whatever differences I have with some of the Federal Reserve's policies, I am confident that Chairman Volcker and the other Federal Reserve Governors believe that bank officers are expected to uphold the highest legal and ethical standards. I would much prefer to leave the safeguarding of the banking system to the Fed and not to the multiple but ineffectual oversight that the Treasury Department advocates.

Where would all this lead? In a recent interview, the Treasury Secretary said we should consolidate regulatory agencies—first the FDIC, FSLIC and Share Insurance Fund, and then the SEC and CFTC—into one all-powerful financial services regulator. This, of course, is fully consistent with the Merrill Lynch concept of one-step supermarket finance. It may be timesaving, but whether it is safe and sound or precludes undue concentration of the financial system is a different matter entirely. The Treasury Secretary's formula for deregulation and decentralization translates into super-regulation and massive concentration, concentration of our entire national financial system in the hands of a few money center managers running the bureaucrats of a superregulatory agency.

As for federalism, the Secretary contemplates the destruction of the dual banking system under the pretext of deregulation. This is a phony issue because the McFadden Act and the Douglas amendment have nothing to do with regulation. They do not impose a single rule or require a single sheet of paper to be filed with the Government. They do not regulate, but actually support the principles of federalism by requiring the national Government to respect the decisions of each State government as to whether out-of-State banks should be permitted to solicit deposits within their borders.

Nor is homogenization inevitable, as the Secretary contends. The plight of thrift institutions, the creation of money market funds, and all the other developments which have raised the issue of change for our financial system were not inevitable, but are

symptoms of the maladies called inflation and high interest rates, conditions the Secretary's policies make worse daily. If these policies had not led to nearly excluding from paying taxes the big corporations and rich individuals the Secretary favors, these problems already would be abating. What we need to do is restore stability to our economy, using economic reason instead of the administration's ideological notions. This is not universally supported. If it happened, the pretexts for trying to destroy our financial system would disappear. If the present difficulties of thrift institutions and other distortions of the system did not exist, these advocates of concentrated wealth would have to create some equivalent condition as an excuse for gaining control of our Nation's finances.

The largest banks already have a big stake in perpetuating these problems. During the last year, tens of millions of dollars have been wagered that Congress will gut the McFadden Act and Douglas amendment. Despite their dubious legality, bank regulatory agencies have not questioned arrangements in which big bank holding companies have acquired voting stock in takeover targets and large portions of nonvoting stock convertible as soon as Federal law is altered to permit interstate branching. These deals have spread from troubled target banks to vigorously healthy banks which happen to be in attractive markets.

The Federal Reserve has remained silent regarding such interstate takeover attempts that stretch current law to near the breaking point. This bidding war is indicative that relaxing barriers against interstate branching would result not in greater efficiency of the banking system but in a great squandering of capital for mergers and acquisitions which would result in a tremendous concentration of our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be deluded that the Reagan administration is curbing the bureaucracy's forays into the forbidden realm of policymaking. Right now, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is trying to force the hand of Congress. Although not permitted by law, a wealth of new commercial activities could be initiated by savings and loan corporations under a February 25 FHLBB proposal. If the Board is allowed to make the proposal a final rule and if this blatant wish list survives the probable barrage of lawsuits, these activities would include:

Offering money market funds and engaging in securities brokerage; underwriting casualty, property, life and private mortgage insurance; manufacturing of mobile homes; collecting debts for other institutions and third parties; issuing letters of credit; operating coin and currency services; leasing both consumer and business goods;

engaging in commercial lending for property owned by third parties; real estate brokerage for third parties; commercial lending without restriction to guaranteed secured loans; managing farms and other real property; servicing all types of loans; preparing tax returns for businesses; investing in certified development corporations; trading GNMA options; and acting as futures commission merchants.

That is a pretty exotic list for institutions created to provide such prosaic products as mortgages.

Where did the FHLBB find the authority to depart so drastically from its central purpose and, in the process, do violence to the Glass-Steagall Act and threaten the entire commercial banking structure? From itself. The Board Chairman explains that:

These proposals reflect the feelings of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board that the allowable activities of institutions are not sufficient to maintain a good, competitive, viable framework in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I have always understood that such important alterations to law are supposed to stem from congressional decisions, not the feelings of a regulatory agency. But, Thomas Vartarian, Board general counsel, contends that the Bank Board should look to the marketplace, not statutory language, to determine what new activities are most appropriate for thrifts.

Bureaucrats are telling Congress that they will be guided by divining the will of the marketplace, rather than following the specific but inconvenient strictures of law.

Mr. Speaker, it obviously is the attitude of the administration that no funds be spent to save the Nation's housing financing system—that, in fact, those pieces that do survive will do so by engaging less in housing finance and more in commercial banking, securities, and even manufacturing.

It is no great surprise that there is little enthusiasm within the administration for providing meaningful relief for the housing industry or that there is not great grief that the housing industry is among the most damaged by administration economic programs. The housing industry is mostly made up of small businesses as builders, local lending institutions, local realtors and individual sellers and buyers. We have an administration that favors big business and big institutions. There are some administration officials who contend money spent on providing housing for people is money ill-spent; that the Nation's wealth should be directed by the Government to big business alone. Compare the modest 1981 tax legislation gains for small business with the monstrous new avoidance opportunities provided for big business.

The administration's rush to proclaim that it will exercise strong, consistent resistance to any bailout proposal, is not based on honestly held ideological grounds with which I may differ, but on a calculated determination to use the thrifts' agony to engineer interstate and interindustry mergers to destroy the basic system.

This is not a Texas issue, or a Sunbelt versus Snowbelt issue. Once these predatory big money interests favored by the administration, especially the Treasury Secretary, are given free rein to enter any market, they will suck up every dime and dollar possible from every local depositor in the country to divert it to their own purposes. These big institutions and corporations are no friends of small business, housing consumers or local governments. They have no identity with any locality, area, State, or region. Many of the largest are foreign-owned and don't even have a national allegiance. Given a dollar's difference, these financiers would rather finance a Shah of Iran or Eastern Bloc development than a small business or consumer purchase on any of our congressional districts. The fact that they would deplete local economies is one which they consider a social problem of government, not one that financiers should concern themselves about.

Mr. Speaker, despite high-sounding rhetoric about New Federalism, the behind-the-scenes struggle to reshape our financial system is being waged daily. The press reports a deep rift between the FDIC chairman and the New York superintendent of banks. The issue is whether the FDIC will permit out-of-State institutions to bid for failing savings banks in the State, contrary to State regulations. The superintendent opposes this usurpation of authority and she is right.

Congress also must reject this strategy of destroying our financial system in order to save it. The thrifts are not anachronisms doomed to extinction. They are vital institutions crippled by high-finance machinations and bad Federal economic policies. If we deal with the problems so as to permit a revitalization of home building, such as a more moderate relationship between Government spending and revenues, the thrifts can again prosper as interest rates decline and economic stability is restored. And they can prosper, knowing that new types of mortgages and new avenues of protection can assure that they do not have to reassume the full risk for rising interest rates.

For instance, the FHLBB already has overhauled its regulations governing the use of financial futures by S. & L's. Hedging with futures has the effect of transforming fixed rate assets into variable rate assets. Had the rule gone into effect earlier, the

thrift industry could have shown a new profit of \$6 billion last year instead of a record \$5 billion in losses. If this one device, future hedging, had been available to thrifts previously, they could have improved their 1981 earnings by \$11 billion, resulting in an aggregate profit instead of a huge loss. This single change is not any panacea, but it should give us pause the next time experts tell us the only way for thrifts to survive is to become commercial banks.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to remember, in the present situation, that the American banking system remains the strongest and most innovative in the world. It meets the credit needs of multinational corporations and local small businesses, of producers and consumers. We have an independent central bank, but we do not have an industry cartel or a banking czar. We have a system which, even with its shortcomings, is envied around the world.

It is true that we have not had a major revision of our banking laws for nearly half a century, but it is also true that we have not had a major panic or financial collapse in those five decades, and that we have maintained a diverse and decentralized system. The world is changing and, if laws fall behind, change may be in order. It should be change to reflect the will of the people through their elected representatives, however, and for the national benefit, not the will of a few political appointees for the benefit of a small number of money- and power-hungry individuals and institutions. We do not need or want the corporate plutocracy toward which the policies of the administration and the Treasury Secretary would take us.

The first step Congress must take is to resolve the thrifts' crisis and detach this short-term problem from consideration of long-term structural issues.

The second step is to reject simplistic arguments to the effect that free enterprise is a free-for-all, survival of the richest, no holds barred.

Prof. James L. Pierce of the University of California explained the dangers of administration policies in December in Banking Committee testimony:

In a mythical world in which deposit insurance was unnecessary, conflicts of interest did not exist, and monopoly practices were impossible, there would be no need to regulate the financial system . . . It is important to bear in mind, however, that the ideal can never be totally achieved and that we may not even come closer to the ideal by decontrolling everything. It is easy to favor eliminating arbitrary laws and regulations that hamper economic efficiency and competition. It is more difficult to devise safeguards that assure financial stability, that prevent monopolization of markets, and that avoid abuses from conflicts of interest. If these safeguards can be built into the financial system, then there is little justification for further government regulation. Un-

fortunately, those who are pressing for deregulation and those who applaud the recent revolution in the financial system seem unconcerned about these safeguards. Unknowingly, the proponents of deregulation without safeguards could be inviting a return to the unstable, anticompetitive and abuse-ridden world of the 1920's.

One potentially destructive aspect of the financial revolution is that the efficacy of deposit insurance could be threatened . . . The creation of deposit insurance, in conjunction with a revitalized Federal Reserve System, has eliminated financial panics and collapse . . . It is essential to realize that with insurance comes the need to regulate . . . The final safeguard concerns the natural tendency of business to monopolize. Adam Smith was one of the first economists to observe this tendency. Rather remarkably, many individuals who invoke the memory of Adam Smith is arguing for the benefits of deregulation conveniently fail to mention the hazards of monopolistic practices in an unregulated world . . . I think we know enough now to realize that the anti-trust laws are not in themselves a sufficient safeguard. . . . Historically, the Federal Reserve Board has attempted to thwart actual and potential monopolistic practices through administration of the Bank Holding Company Act . . . If the Treasury's proposal concerning deregulation of the bank holding companies became law, virtually all firms, including bank holding companies, would be beyond the Fed's reach.

Regulating our financial system is necessary. The only question is how much. The best way to minimize regulation is our dual banking system. Its primary feature is regulatory competition between State and Federal banking officials. It is creative tension, growing directly out of our federalist system, which assures that financial institutions are not smothered in red-tape.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Secretary, claiming deregulation, would, in fact, destroy the very system which assures the limitation of regulation. With interstate banking would come the demise of State regulators and the end of the dual banking system. With the growth of financial supermarkets would come the great, all-knowing Federal super regulators. I foresee a system of new regulations, geared to the far-flung and diverse activities of financial giants, in which our smaller, community-based institutions would be swept away. The financial system would become less safe and less secure. Depositors' protection would erode as insurance funds are drained away for cannibalistic mergers. Opportunities for oligopolistic concentration and concealed conflicts of interest would mushroom.

Instead of destroying the present regulatory system, we should fit needed change into its framework. The distinctly American separation of banking and commerce still makes good sense and is necessary.

We should pare away unnecessary regulation and subject institutions providing identical services to uniform regulation, regardless of their label.

It would best serve the diversity of our States and communities to preserve a financial system which encourages competition and diversity in size and function among financial institutions.

And, finally, it would be grossly irresponsible for us to allow wide-ranging changes to be forced upon us by a narrow-focus, special interest-serving Cabinet member and overreaching bureaucrats with disregard for the impact upon safety and soundness of deposit, credit and investment systems.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has laid down a challenge to Congress. If we do not respond adequately, I fear that we will witness the destruction of our financial system. We must reject efforts by the forces of concentrated wealth to gain even greater control of our Nation's financial welfare for relatively few corporate plutocrats.

Thank you.●

THE THIRD ANNUAL SPRING PREMIER AWARDS DINNER

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me, for the third year, to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on the honorees at the Third Annual Spring Premier Awards Dinner.

This presentation will be made by the Black United Service Clubs of Johnstown at their dinner on April 24. Please let me mention the people honored for their community service and dedication to the Johnstown area.

Andrew J. Gleason—Mr. Gleason has devoted much of his life to improving the Johnstown area and has a distinguished record in improving racial relations. He was a lawyer for the NAACP, and helped bring the first black into the Pennsylvania State Cabinet.

Eleanor Haselrig—Mrs. Haselrig is a past recipient of the citizen's award of the Johnstown NAACP chapter, and has more than 25 years of service to the community through such efforts as the Red Cross, Young Women's Christian Association, and work at the Pleasant Hill Baptist Church.

Joseph McGauley—Reverend McGauley is pastor of the Jefferson Memorial First Born Church and has been particularly active in community youth work. He is youth coordinator for the 13-State North/Northwestern Diocese and has worked with the Cambria County mental health mental retardation program.

Howard M. Picking, Jr.—Mr. Picking is a distinguished leader of the Johns-

town community and has been involved with such groups as the chamber of commerce, Boy Scouts, community chest, Red Cross, and the Johnstown Area Regional Industries. Mr. Picking has been actively involved in almost every phase of development and growth of the Johnstown area.

Hope B. Johnson—Mrs. Johnson has a record of community service that covers work with the Johnstown NAACP, the YMCA, Girl Scouts, and has worked on the Keystone Health Systems Agency and State health coordinating council. Mrs. Johnson has also been a former member of the Johnstown Advisory Council of the State Human Relations Commission.

Edward Stofko—Mr. Stofko is well known in Johnstown for his constant work with youth and the athletic community. He has been a trainer for the Greater Johnstown High School for 31 years, and has been actively involved in all major sporting events in the Johnstown area.

Certainly, a special word goes to the award being presented posthumously to the late Rev. Stephen Slavik who was pastor of St. Rochus' Catholic Church. I worked with Father Slavik extensively during the 1977 Johnstown flood recovery effort, and his untimely death is a personal loss to all of us, and a terrible loss to the community.

This annual dinner is in the greatest tradition of America. It is a tradition that recognizes the tremendous community spirit that helps make America unique. It is also recognition of the effort being made to insure that our country goes forward with harmony and peace.

I congratulate all the winners of this year's recognition at the Spring Premier Awards Dinner, and I also congratulate Allen Andrews and all the community members who make this important dinner a reality. ●

UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN RELATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a speech delivered on March 25, 1982, by Evan G. Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to France, on U.S. relations with our European allies and East-West ties in general.

The speech, which was delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, concludes with the proposition that if the United States were to withdraw its troops from Europe, the Soviet Union would soon dominate Europe. He says "That is the road to defeat: It begins with the withdrawal

of our troops, a road from which there is no exit, no turning back."

Ambassador Galbraith's speech follows:

THE ROAD TO DEFEAT

Address by Evan G. Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to France at a Meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations, Harold Pratt House, Thursday, March 25, 1982, New York City.

My proposition is that if the United States were to withdraw its troops from Europe, the Soviet Union would soon dominate Europe, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, Africa, and then Japan. The Western Hemisphere would become isolated and the United States would ultimately be faced with the Hobsonian choice of war or surrender. That is the Road to Defeat; it begins with the withdrawal of our troops, a road from which there is no exit, no turning back.

Let me give you a glimpse of the nightmare scenario that illustrates my proposition:

The time is the mid 1980's;

The place is Europe;

The precipitating event is the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe, despite the pleas of our NATO allies who are left demoralized.

The Soviets follow our withdrawal by offering an enormous order for West German goods—pipe, truck factories, turbines, computers, hospitals, a vast new telephone system (\$25 billion of business for West Germany industry), hailed as the Deal of the Century—in conjunction with a dramatic reduction in troops and arms in each of the two Germanies and a plan for unification. The East German Army will be taken from active duty and reduced to reserve status leaving only an internal police force. Conscription will be stopped. The Soviet Army will withdraw from East Germany, in orderly phases over three years. In exchange, the West German Army will begin retiring its forces from active duty into the reserves. Conscription will end. All British and French troops will be withdrawn by no more than three years. A unification Commission will be established, with only Germans involved, with the mandate to draft a constitution for a united Germany which like Austria would not be a member of the Warsaw Pact or the North Atlantic Alliance. Meanwhile all nuclear weapons will be forbidden in both Germanies. A specific date will be set for the destruction of the Berlin and East German Wall at which time the new constitution will be submitted to all the German people for acceptance or rejection by universal vote.

Elements of the left wing of the SPD immediately support the Soviet offer and launch a campaign called Peace, Unity and Prosperity (PUP) for the entire plan to be adopted. (The Chancellor, the Foreign Minister and the leaders of the opposition firmly reject the plan as a trap). The debate rages in Western Germany and the first polls show 35% in favor of the offer, 45% opposed, and 20% don't know. After a week of highly emotional speeches, widely watched by television, the darkhorse head of the faction favoring acceptance of the Soviet offer is elected leader and the Chancellor resigns. The Free Democrats drop from the coalition and the Bundestag is dissolved. An election is set and the campaign begins. The outpouring is intense, bordering on hysteria. PUP marches, rallies and television shows are everywhere. Our own TV

networks comment favorably on the professional way the PUP campaign is being run, well financed and well organized. The parties are splintered but a coalition of those favoring the Soviet offer win, 52% to 48% and accept the Soviet proposal; the disarmament and unification process begins.

Faced with a demilitarized, neutralized Germany, some of the smaller allies caucus and subsequently give notice to withdraw from NATO. One country is offered a 25 year supply of gas from the Soviet Union on most favored nation terms. Another sells oil on a long term contract to the Soviet Union at favorable prices.

This oil is dedicated by the Soviets for refining in a third country, thus saving that important industry from disaster. The refined products are to be sold to Western Europe at such attractive prices, it is estimated that gasoline prices will drop by 10 percent; this is enthusiastically received by the politicians fighting inflation, i.e. they are saved from having to cut their important social programs. France and Britain, standing firm, form a Defense Alliance evoking memories of 1914 and 1939. But other countries announce a wait and see policy, or experience bitter factional strife that effectively removes them from the alliance.

Heralding it as an answer to Japan, European automobile manufacturers announce a joint venture to build in the Soviet Union the largest automobile/truck plant in the world, whose output will be sold by the network of dealers of the joint venture partners throughout the world. Because of the competitive cost of labor in the USSR, Japanese and American car prices will be undercut.

The carrot and stick are then turned toward France and Britain. Sensing an electoral advantage, the Prime Minister asks the Queen to dissolve Parliament but in the ensuing election, the government loses to an anti-nuclear coalition. The new British Prime Minister goes to the Soviet Union for talks and returns to announce triumphantly that there will be peace and prosperity in our time.

The Soviet Union promises the Prime Minister to freeze further European deployment of the SS20 (stopping at 500) and agrees to ship them all to the Far East out of range of Europe, covering only China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, in exchange for Britain and France giving up their nuclear weapons. (The Peace Dividend from canceling the Trident will be 8 billion pounds). The Soviet Union also agrees that once this is done they will agree to give up their strategic ICBM's provided the U.S. does the same. Talks will begin as soon as the disarmament agreement is implemented in Europe. Britain is offered an Export Order for \$15 billion worth of oil tankers for its depressed nationalized shipyards. You see, the Soviet Union is about to become a large oil exporter due to the chancover of its industry to gas, made possible by the Siberian Gas Pipeline. Britain ceases to be a nuclear power.

France is alone; its President sends a high level delegation to Washington to discuss defense strategy. The delegation's trip to Charles de Gaulle airport is delayed for two hours by 100,000 Peace Marchers (organized by foreigners) who wound 78 policemen, which act is justified by the TV news broadcasts that night showing scenes of police brutality in dragging off the demonstrators who were lying down in the road to the airport.

The Egyptian President is shot by a religious fanatic who, it is later revealed, had recently spent three months skiing in Czechoslovakia. The Colonel who leads the Revolutionary Council which takes over asks for help from the Soviet Union against Israel which has begun to mobilize after the Egyptian leader's death. Overflying Greece, the Soviets send two airborne divisions to Egypt. This is acclaimed by Libya, Syria and the PLO as the beginning of the Final Solution to the Israeli Problem.

I think I have said enough; each one of you, with a little imagination, can make up his own Dismal Scenario down the remainder of the Road to Defeat. It could become a game, like Dungeons and Dragons and sweep the country. Why not play games, why not "Eat, Drink and be Merry for tomorrow", if we retreat from Europe, we may die.

It is, however, not necessary we take this road; we will take it only if we are misled, misinformed, duped. Duped implies a conscious effort by someone, in this case the Soviet Union, to maneuver the victim, the U.S., into a disadvantageous position. Now we are unable to verify that Lenin was inspired by his readings from P. T. Barnum that "There is a sucker born every minute" or that Brezhnev has the movie *The Sting* replayed nightly before the Politburo. But we have concluded that there is a very sophisticated Soviet effort afoot to con us suckers into withdrawing our troops from Europe. And if you were Brezhnev you would be doing the same thing.

There are of course intelligent men of good will in the West who have reached their decision about troop withdrawal independently from the Soviet effort to disinform. Thus, it is not enough, in order to overcome the Withdrawalists, simply to point out that they are in the same bed as the Soviets. We must examine the arguments for withdrawal on the merits. This is what I intend to do now in summary form.

The argument for withdrawal most effectively used today is: Should the Soviet attack in Western Europe, our 300,000 U.S. forces will be overrun and slaughtered in days and why should we sacrifice our boys for selfish, petulant Europe.

Will they be Overrun? While we all comprehend the offensive might of the Red Army and the need to improve NATO's defenses by deploying cruise and Pershing II missiles, is the military situation as hopeless as some arm chair generals would have it? No, as matters now stand, NATO military forces create too many risks for the Soviets to attack Western Europe. What are these risks?

First, there is the strategic risk that in defense of American forces the U.S. will counter-attack the Soviet Union. Without our troops, there is less risk of a strategic riposte to defend Europe. But let us leave that aside and look solely at the theater risks.

A. To exploit their military advantage the Soviets must group together large concentrations of men and material. In military jargon, they must create targets either by a buildup at the outset before the attack or in the second echelon, a second echelon that must follow after a surprise attack by the troops already in place in Eastern Europe.

Our electronics are such that any Soviet buildup will be detected. This leaves the Soviets two choices, both poor: attempt a surprise attack during, say, maneuvers in the Eastern countries or a buildup over a period, say three weeks, knowing the buildup will

be detected. Concentration of men and materials runs counter to modern military doctrine, dispersal is the name of the game, given the firepower of modern warfare, but to bring their superior numbers to bear they must concentrate and expose themselves, at least temporarily, to our counter firepower. If the Soviets were to launch a surprise attack with a little prior buildup, then they must quickly build up the second echelon to follow because without the second echelon the first echelon alone could not defeat the Allied armies and would be vulnerable to counterattack. That second echelon build up will present hundreds of targets and several vulnerable choke points. Their probable losses will be substantial and they may not be able to maneuver quickly enough to support an initially successful first wave. On the other hand, if the Soviets concentrate and buildup first, before attacking, their vulnerability is even greater because our full counterfire against both the first and second echelons can be amassed and brought to bear in a matter of minutes after that first Soviet tank rolls across the border.

B. The next problem the Soviets face is a fundamental assumption they must make in attacking U.S. and NATO forces in Western Europe, namely the assumption that NATO may use theater nuclear weapons to attack military targets in the Eastern countries and in the Western USSR. This may not be the case, but the Soviets must plan for it. This illustrates the deterrent value of nuclear weapons. Indeed, nuclear weapons can be used effectively by NATO and at the same time the U.S. can give a clear signal we are not escalating to strategic nuclear warfare. NATO's use of theater nuclear weapons diminishes substantially the Soviet chance of success: the second echelon chokepoints, military bases, assembly points, airfields, missile sites, naval bases (the European Red Fleet could be left without a base to come home to) railheads, roads, pipelines, communications and reserve supplies, could be dealt mortal blows. NATO theater nuclear weapons are an equalizer. They badly need to be improved by deploying Pershing II and Cruise Missiles, but even today NATO is not without theater nuclear cards. As an aside to our European friends I would like to point out that any counter attack by NATO with theater weapons is apt, in the first and most devastating phase, to fall on Eastern Europe and Western USSR. That is where the targets are, not in Western Europe.

C. Air Superiority. It would be difficult for the Soviets to sustain an offensive in Western Europe without control of the air. Tactical control over the advancing Soviet Army, defensive control over military targets in the East, and control over Western European bases are all essential. We do not have the time nor the talent tonight to fight these air battles but suffice to say that the 4,000 NATO combat aircraft (including France) which would be involved could well hold their own against the Warsaw Pact's 5,500 attacking aircraft. Today, as opposed to World War II, we must also take account of a number of other factors when we undertake to judge control of the air: SAM missiles, air to ground missiles, helicopters, electronic gear, dispersed airfields, replacement rate, etc. It is all very complicated but the Soviets could easily fail in their initial effort to knock us out of the air, and replacements would be quickly forthcoming. From the Soviet point of view, the prognosis for the air aspects of a European offensive is not reassuring.

D. Anti-tank Weapons. This is an area where NATO land forces have developed, not surprisingly, an ability to compensate for Soviet tank superiority. We have a wide range of highly mobile and very effective anti-tank weapons, many of which are man carried. A Soviet tank and Armored Personnel Carrier attack would suffer large losses, inflicted by small units. NATO's anti-tank arsenal will also soon include a variety of relatively cheap precision-guided munitions which will be capable of awesome levels of destruction of massed armored vehicles. The Warsaw Pact is years away from having the capability to counter those munitions.

E. The Soviets' Warsaw Pact "Allies" cannot be relied on by the Soviets, either for the loyalty of their fighting forces or as a safe area through which Soviet reinforcements and supplies must come. This means the Soviets must be prepared to divert their own military resources to maintain lines of communication in their rear. Soviet military planners must assume that sabotage and insurrection in these areas may be serious.

F. The NATO armies can inflict substantial losses, maneuver as necessary and remain essentially intact. Soviet initial advances would not necessarily mean the end of large numbers on NATO troops. NATO's winning or losing would depend more on the ability of the Soviets to bring up their second echelon than on NATO's ability to stand and fight. If the second echelon were delayed, NATO counterattacks could be decisive. As long as NATO retained the ability to devastate the Soviet rear, NATO armies, once reinforced, could cut off initial Soviet salients. Incidentally, the four U.S. divisions in Europe (two armored and two mechanized infantry, plus three brigades and two regiments) would be reinforced dramatically within 30 days of a Soviet attack. In other words the Soviets are faced with the possibility of fighting a resilient foe with defense in depth and substantial reserve strength, i.e. staying power.

G. As long as U.S. troops are in Germany, a Soviet attack means declaring war in one stroke on the U.S., Germany, U.K., France, Italy, the other NATO countries and Spain. This is a big bite to take on all at once. Much better for the Soviets if the U.S. pulls out, which would allow the Soviets to take the others over piecemeal, probably without firing a shot.

It is fashionable to sneer at the armed forces of our allies but they do add up to a considerable force and add to the unlikelihood that the U.S. forces will be overrun. Let us look briefly at these forces:

1. The German Army of 335,000 men (12 divisions) is well-trained, equipped and motivated. Its 100,000 man Air Force with 550 combat aircraft contributes substantially to NATO's air power. Germany's total active strength is 500,000 with reserves of 750,000.

2. France has an army of 310,000 which includes 8 armored and 7 other divisions plus several independent regiments and 280,000 reserves. Its 600 combat aircraft are impressive to the Soviets but even more so are its 5 nuclear missile submarines, 18 nuclear ICM's and other nuclear weapons. Taken as a whole, this is Europe's strongest national force.

3. Britain's army is only 175,000 but its 55,000 man Army of the Rhine is well equipped to defend, together with the RAF, against a Soviet tank led attack in its northern sector.

These, plus the other NATO forces all add up to about 1,000,000 combat troops on the Western front, enough, together with our

air power, missiles, tanks and anti-tank weapons to deal with a surprise Soviet attack by its forces now in Eastern Europe. The question would be whether or not the Soviets could bring their second echelon quickly to bear or would it take too many losses at the assembly and chokepoints to be able to consolidate initial gains. That is a question which is impossible for the Soviets to answer with certitude.

H. One final comment on risks the Soviets must run. They must also consider whether the French would fire their strategic nuclear weapons if a victorious Red Army has cut through Germany and the Low Countries and is at the French border. The same consideration applies to the British. This is Catch-22 for the Soviets; a victory in Germany could trigger an European strategic attack which could then require a damaged Soviet Union to attack the U.S. This is just all too risky for the Soviets. Much better to talk the U.S. troops out and put pressure on France and Britain after Germany is neutralized and the world is not at war.

Let us deal quickly with other arguments in favor of a withdrawal:

A. The Allies must be jolted into defending themselves.

While this is a tempting position, it is probably the most juvenile of all the withdrawal arguments. Let us, however, deal with it patiently. A country, bordering on the Soviet Bloc, without nuclear weapons, cannot expect to defend itself. Germany has no nuclear weapons. If we pull out, the nuclear weapons will come with us. Giving Germany nuclear weapons is not realistic. France, Britain, Germany, and the Soviet Union would resist it. No, for now, Germany would be left without nuclear weapons and would be helpless, even if it quadrupled its conventional army. Perhaps France and Britain will someday be able to replace our nuclear arms in Germany in exchange for a massive German buildup of their conventional forces. While this remains an intriguing, theoretical possibility, Germany would be long gone to the Soviets before this nuclear substitution could be pulled off.

A non-nuclear Germany, abandoned by the United States, would be jolted all right—into accommodation with the Soviet Union. And if this happens to the Germans could the Low Countries and Scandinavia, and all the rest be far behind?

B. And then there is the argument that if the Europeans are not willing to defend themselves, then they are not worthy of our help and to hell with them.

This withdrawal argument allows me to make the essential point of this talk: We must remain in Europe for our own selfish purposes. We should stay because if we don't, Europe will fall to the Soviets and we will be mortally wounded.

The fact is there are Europeans who are willing to defend themselves, but only if it is not hopeless. Without us it looks helpless. France spends almost 4% of its GNP and is increasing its defense budget this year by 4%. It is modernizing and adding to its nuclear weapons. Britain recently committed to the expensive Trident II. Both the major parties in Germany strongly support the deployment of Pershing II and Cruise Missiles, so-called Peace Movements notwithstanding. Shortly after being elected, President Mitterrand quickly supported Schmidt in this crucial point.

Europe's defense spending is about \$100 billion per annum, not too bad given the adverse impact of the policy of detente we helped generate. Their weapons develop-

ment program is impressive. Above all, there are men of will in Europe, leaders who are willing and able to assume a strong and resolute defense. A recent Gallup poll revealed 75% in Britain, 74% in Germany, and 57% in France prefer to fight rather than accept Soviet domination.

The Western alliance is not doomed as long as we stay put, modernizing our weapons as needed. Today this means deploying the Pershing II, the Cruise Missiles, and the electronic warfare systems sought by SACEUR.

C. Let us conclude our look at the Withdrawal arguments, by just touching on three points. First, the naval argument. Why not just increase our missile submarines and lie off the coast of Europe and blast the Soviet Army if and when they make a move Westward? The fundamental truth is that to the Germans these missiles are no more credible than our missiles in the continental U.S. The Europeans don't believe we would fire them, given the massive Soviet strategic capability, just to defend Europe. Once those missiles come roaring out of the sea, they will be spotted and the holocaust may begin. There must be a visible link between the U.S. and the defense of Europe. That link is now provided by U.S. forces, including land-based nuclear forces, in Europe. In the event of a withdrawal, the Soviets could find our commitment less than credible. Deterrence would be gravely weakened. Furthermore, our allies might also doubt our commitment, and seek accommodations with the Soviets.

Second, why not reduce our forces to a trip wire of say one division? The answer here is that these forces would be overrun; they would not be able to deal with the first wave of a surprise Soviet attack and we would have to turn immediately to nuclear weapons. We are at the minimum troop level now. As important, if we begin to reduce the troops, the rot would set in, political accommodation would start and we would come under pressure at home to remove our remaining division as people began to realize they would be slaughtered by a Soviet attack. The Germans would soon pressure us to remove our missiles. Trip wires may have been plausible, although I doubt it, before the Soviets had their recent power and ability to decimate large sections of the U.S. Now they are an empty slogan.

Withdrawal means walking away from U.S. military bases in Europe which represent tens of billions of dollars of investment in military infrastructure by the U.S. and NATO over the past several decades. Such facilities do not exist in the U.S. and could not be duplicated except at enormous cost. Withdrawal therefore will probably mean disbanding the divisions we bring home for the sake of economy. This will be a double blow to our military strength.

After withdrawal we must be ready to accept a diminished role in world affairs and the greatly reduced influence we would have over international questions related to Europe. Our trade with Europe, now our greatest export market, would surely decline as the Europeans accommodated themselves to new realities. Europe is apt to be forced to choose a role of supporting and helping a stagnant Soviet system do what it cannot do for itself. A Europe which turns East and is gradually enlisted in the service of assisting the USSR through its better economic system will be a Europe which has turned from alliance with the U.S. to a role of our gravedigger.

The Declaration of Independence set as a mandate for our national efforts that all men have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our postwar alliance with Europe was in keeping with our country's most cherished values and its highest destiny. As a nation of honor and vision, we cannot walk away from such responsibilities.

Our national interest is as clear now as it was when the Atlantic Alliance was founded; it is a close partnership with the Western European democracies whose heritage and values we share. We can no more abandon them than we could abandon Maine or Massachusetts. This is the message I leave with you tonight.●

WALTER FALLON, KODAK CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, URGES CAUTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION CUTS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent outstanding address to the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities, Walter Fallon, chairman and chief executive officer of Eastman Kodak Co., spoke out on the need for careful consideration of the Nation's budgetary agenda and its effect on higher education. Mr. Fallon voiced the concerns of many in both the public and private sectors. He championed a strong, three-way partnership between business, higher education, and Government as a means to foster economic growth. Further, and more significantly, Mr. Fallon noted the impossibility of business "replacing" the real and projected reductions in Federal assistance for higher education.

Under Mr. Fallon's leadership, Kodak has made record contributions for higher education. Kodak's contribution of \$7.1 million includes appropriations of \$4.9 million for the support of higher education through Kodak's education aid program, and an additional \$2.2 million in annual support for the continued education of people affiliated with Kodak. These figures make Kodak's commitment to education quite obvious. In his speech, Mr. Fallon alluded to those figures and made the salient point that, "the corporation that is not in the business of human development may not be in any business—at least not for long." He added that Kodak views investment in education as the "critical capital" to meet changes in both the plant and equipment of Eastman Kodak, as well as society in general.

In his remarks, Mr. Fallon addressed numerous points of President Reagan's budget initiatives, but specifically singled out the proposed cuts in education as "too much, too soon."

Mr. Fallon stated that, "drastic actions have a high probability of failure when there is no allowance for a period of adjustment." I concur with Mr. Fallon's insightful evaluation of the proposed Federal spending cuts in higher education, and would like to share his remarks with my colleagues. Mr. Fallon's speech follows:

SPEECH BY WALTER FALLON

Thank you . . . and good morning. When I was considering what I might say to you today, I was reminded of the story about Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Holmes was a distinguished American author and physician . . . who was also known for being quite absent-minded.

Once, when Holmes was on a train, he was asked for his ticket, and he could not find it. He searched in all his pockets and his briefcase . . . but was still not able to produce it. The conductor, knowing Mr. Holmes and his sterling reputation, tried to put him at ease:

"Never mind," he said. "I know you're good for it. When you find your ticket, I'm certain you will mail it in."

But Holmes grew even more agitated. "Mr. Conductor," he replied, "the question is not 'where is my ticket?' . . . the question is 'where am I going!'"

On a more serious note, the question for all of us here today certainly is: "Where are we going?" It's at the top of our shared agenda in our mutual concern for the future of higher education.

What I'd like to do this morning is focus our attention on two aspects of that agenda that are of vital interest to us all.

The first, at the state level, is the creation of a more effective, three-way partnership among business and industry . . . higher education . . . and state government . . . in order to foster economic development in New York State.

The second, at the national level, is the need for our careful consideration of the overall impact that could result from the far-reaching review of federal programs now underway in the area of higher education . . . on the one hand, we sense an opportunity. It comes with the fresh consideration of the overall objectives that should guide this nation's policy in higher education.

On the other hand, we sense a growing concern. It stems from a fear that budgetary pressures will lead to ad-hoc decisions on particular programs. And these decisions, in turn, may not reflect our long-term national interests.

Both of these agenda items—at the state and national levels—point up the new economic realities facing higher education today. Both call for new directions from all those involved. And both underscore our mutual goal:

The creative management of our shared investments in higher education . . . in order to generate useful dividends for all three sectors in this three-way partnership.

I suppose it will come as no surprise to you that we apply these same "investment criteria" when it comes to corporate contributions by the Eastman Kodak Company.

Indeed, we have said on many occasions that we see philanthropy as a business investment . . . to be managed in a business-like way.

In this case, it's an investment in the future of society . . . designed to generate long-term dividends.

We attempt to direct our contributions activity in the same way we manage our other

business endeavors. After all, the business we run at Kodak places us among the top 30 Fortune companies.

But the size of the business we manage in corporate contributions puts us among the top 15 nationwide.

Our priorities are clear: we see management's first responsibility as maintaining the economic health of the business enterprise.

In my view, the definition of corporate responsibility begins with the responsibility for the success of the economic function of the business.

At the same time, as one of my predecessors put it, "The corporation that is not in the business of human development may not be in any business—at least not for long."

That's why corporations like Eastman Kodak and many others—including these represented by the business leaders I see here today—support the institutions that prepare the professional, technical, and skilled people needed by the business community.

As one of our managers pointed out, it's a merger of opportunities: corporations commit funds to support vital educational activities. The schools turn out graduates needed to plan and manage the corporations' future growth.

In the end, it's just plain good business—for the corporation, for higher education, for the individual student, and for the larger community as well.

At Kodak, this view of the business of corporate contributions is based upon the legacy of our founder, George Eastman.

Early in his career, Eastman realized that he needed to invest not only in the plant and equipment of the Eastman Kodak Company . . . but also in the plant and equipment of society.

And while he supported a number of important areas that contribute to the quality of life—as Kodak does today—Eastman identified education as the critical capital to meet these changes.

"The future of the world," he once said, "depends almost entirely upon education."

George Eastman invested heavily in education, as many of you know. Earlier in this century, he contributed millions to build the physical plant of several major universities.

But today, while that physical plant exists, our educational institutions often lack the financial resources to use it to its fullest advantage.

That's why our goals for investment in higher education for the 80's have been designed with new directions in mind: Now, rather than invest in capital improvements . . . we seek to invest in excellence—in outstanding students and faculty—as an expression of Kodak's continuing commitment to education in today's changing society.

And the level of our investment is significant. In fact, I'm pleased to announce this morning that Kodak's nationwide corporate contributions totalled 10.5 million dollars in 1981—a new record for the company.

Of that amount, nearly half—4.9 million dollars—was designated for the support of higher education through our Educational Aid Program.

That's in addition to the more than 2.2 million dollars in annual support for opportunities in continuing education for Kodak people. These include funds for tuition aid, academic assignments, and master's and doctoral awards.

Why, you might ask, do Kodak and other corporate givers place so much importance

on integrating contributions with business operations? I can give you two reasons from the Kodak perspective.

First, structuring our contributions program along lines of corporate self-interest is the best way we know to serve our shareholder's interests.

Second, we're convinced we generate more dividends from our investment of resources when we give in areas allied to our own fields of expertise. As a knowledgeable donor, we can select better recipients for our always limited contributions resources.

I'm sure you know others in business and industry who are saying—and doing—the same thing.

These expanded criteria—for corporate support that parallels corporate business interests—are among the new realities facing higher education in the 80's. Indeed, the responsibility that management feels reflects the magnitude of that support nationwide.

Last year, for example, American corporations donated more than 1.1 billion dollars to U.S. colleges and universities.

Closer to home, a 1980-81 survey by the Council for Financial Aid to Education showed that 77 public and independent institutions in New York State received 52.1 million dollars from business.

That same research group reported, on a national level, that corporations give about 18.2 percent of all the voluntary support received by public and independent higher education. Statewide, corporate giving represents about 18.5 percent of voluntary support.

Clearly, the investment is high. That's why Kodak and other companies are constantly assessing new directions in response to new realities in corporate giving.

I think you can expect to see even more business initiatives in this area.

The goal is understandable: to control and target financial support in order to generate the most useful dividends from corporate investments in higher education.

Kodak has already taken a number of steps in this direction. In 1981, for example, the company expanded its research grants to specific graduate departments. Our objective is to encourage scientific exploration in areas related to Kodak's own diverse research and development programs.

In 1980, we shifted away from an automatic formula for alumni grants to all schools represented by Kodak employees with five or more years' experience.

Today, we target our contributions to the educational institutions that are most productive to the company from the standpoint of recruitment and needed technology.

Other corporations are moving along the same path. Last year, for example, IBM announced a nationwide program totalling 1 million dollars. It targets a number of 25,000 dollar grants each year to specific departments within individual schools.

In 1982, General Electric launched a pilot program of "forgivable loans" for doctoral students who remain in academic teaching. Four schools will each receive 50,000 dollars to be used as a loan fund for graduate students in engineering and computer sciences. Students may borrow up to 5,000 dollars a year until they complete their studies. And, if they choose academic teaching as their profession, 20 percent of the loan will be forgiven each year.

Today's new realities are spurring new directions within New York State, as well. There is growing recognition within state government of the need to strengthen the links between our universities and the busi-

ness community. It's clear that through the enhancement of this three-way partnership, our economy can benefit from the entrepreneurial development of new technology.

I commend the leadership within C. I. C. U. that identified these initiatives.

I commend the Governor, who subsequently incorporated a number of these proposals in his Economic Development Program this year.

And I commend the bipartisan legislative support that has generated.

I'll touch on just three examples that reflect these new directions in New York State.

The first is the proposal for the creation of the New York State Center for industrial innovation to be located at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy.

The purpose of this Center will be to demonstrate New York State's commitment to high technology. And it will do so in three important ways.

By helping to retain existing high technology business within the state . . . by helping to attract new high technology businesses from out-of-state . . . and by helping to nurture new ventures within New York's high technology industries.

At Eastman Kodak, we know well the benefits that the proposed Center can foster. In our case, for example, the majority of Kodak products on the market today have been there less than five years.

That's why Kodak, along with other companies such as GE and IBM, are strongly supporting the Center. And that's why the New York State Business Council has recommended adoption of the proposal. Here's how Council President Raymond Schuler put it:

"New Yorkers already have the brains and the determination to move into the future. The new Center at RPI will help make sure that they have the tools as well."

Closely related to the Center is the second new direction I want to mention: the proposed formation of the New York State Research University Consortium.

Initially, it will draw together some 15 public and independent institutions. They are among the leading research universities of New York State.

All of these institutions have strong science and engineering research capabilities. They offer expertise in fields that are extremely important to complement the central focus provided by the Center at RPI.

The Consortium would be developed to share knowledge and ideas with industry . . . to exchange skilled people and to share instrumentation . . . and to represent New York's great technological assets to the nation.

The third new direction I want to mention . . . as outlined in the state's economic development program . . . is the creation of "centers of excellence." These would be in other areas of technology that offer the potential of rapid development. In fact, the legislative language calls these, "Centers for Technology Development."

Under this proposal, the State Science and Technology Foundation would designate as many as five such centers at selected institutions of higher education. Each center would specialize.

Areas could include genetic engineering, fiber optics, or new materials. Each offers significant potential for economic growth. In order to win this designation, schools would be called upon to demonstrate excellence in one of these fields.

And, just as important, they would have to secure the commitment for matching

support from the business community on at least a dollar-for-dollar basis.

In my view, these are the kinds of new directions we need to deal with the new realities.

They represent shared investments in excellence by business, government, and higher education. They offer the potential of significant dividends in terms of technological leadership and economic development. And these, in turn, can translate into that all-important commodity called jobs.

And, finally, they capitalize on one of our region's strongest resources—the strength and diversity of our institutions of higher education.

It's an educational system that functions in many ways to meet a broad spectrum of needs—from technical training at the two-year and community college level . . . to the leading edge of research underway at our universities.

We share other concerns as well. I'm aware, for example, of recent initiatives by the institutions that produce nearly 75 percent of the engineering degrees in New York State.

They want to draw attention to such critical areas as . . . the shortage of engineering school faculty; the obsolescence of much of our current instructional and research equipment; the need for continuing focus on support for gifted minority students; and, of course, the growing needs for increased financial aid for the vast majority of all students.

These and other programs have been identified by C.I.C.U. through its 1982 legislative agenda . . . by the state government in a number of proposals now going through the legislative budget process . . . and by corporations themselves, through their new thrusts in corporate giving.

In fact, a number of our own recent initiatives in the Kodak Educational Aid Program reflect concerns that parallel many of those on the C.I.C.U. agenda.

For example, we recently established *The Kodak Teaching Incentive Grants* as one response to the charge that business "has been eating its own seed corn." That means, simply, that corporations have been taking the best and brightest graduates away from the classroom.

Now, through its new grant program, Kodak is encouraging outstanding doctoral graduates to pursue engineering and scientific careers in teaching and research.

Through another initiative, we established *The Kodak Fellows Program* to encourage scientific inquiry and excellence through grants for graduate students in engineering and science.

The Kodak Minority Academic Awards Program identifies minority students who have proven themselves scholastically. Kodak grants provide scholarships in science, engineering, and business.

And, *The Kodak Scholars Program* is designed to encourage excellence and scientific inquiry for selected undergraduate students; 560 college students are now in the annual enrollment of this program.

Our expenditures here last year totalled more than 1 million dollars.

Of course, no discussion of the economy and higher education would be complete without the second item that I mentioned as part of our shared agenda: The new realities at the Federal level—and the resulting new directions that will be required from all sectors involved in higher education.

Let me say, at the outset, that—like many of you—I view the Reagan initiatives as a move in the right direction.

But, like many of you, I would urge caution particularly in the amount of the proposed cutbacks in higher education as "too much, too soon."

Indeed, if the 1983 budget cuts are implemented as they were submitted, higher education is looking at truly significant decreases. Recommended cuts would bring some student-aid programs to levels 46 percent below Fiscal Year 1982.

Federal cuts of this magnitude would remove over a million students nationwide from eligibility for the Pell grants.

From my own business experience, I know that any budget—no matter how small—can be cut 5 percent. And that any budget—no matter how large—is not bad enough to justify a 46 percent cut. In a word, drastic actions have a high probability of failure when there is no allowance for a period of adjustment.

Plainly, within New York State, the impact would be severe. State Education Commissioner Gordon Ambach—from whom you'll hear later this morning—has said that, under the proposed Reagan budget, students in higher education would lose the availability of guaranteed loans and grants totalling more than 660 million dollars over the next two years.

The SUNY Board of Trustees, in their resolution issued last month, estimated that New York State students eligible for the basic Pell grants would drop nearly in half . . . from about 321,000 to fewer than 183,000.

President Frank Rhodes of Cornell has expressed the concern this way: "It is time to reconsider the current federal budget proposals. To urge this is not to deny that federal spending must be reduced. It is not to deny that some abuses in the use of student aid have occurred. It is not to claim some special exemption for educational needs. But it is to assert that federal support for education involves not only spending . . . but also investment—an investment in the future of individuals and of the nation."

President Rhodes concludes: "If the cost of education seems high . . . ponder the cost of ignorance." (Unquote)

What we are seeing today is a major change in federal policy. It would be tragic if such a change were to be made without the most careful consideration of its overall impact.

Indeed, it is clear that there is a need for a re-examination of the role and contribution of each of the sectors in our partnership.

At the national level, we need to review the existing Federal aid programs. And, while we commend the opportunity for redefinition of our national policies on higher education, we should also encourage dialogue and debate on the effects of these policies, long-term.

Perhaps this is the time to clear the books of the many federal grant programs and start anew.

Through this period of uncertainty, we should bear in mind a fundamental concept. A college education has real commercial value. It is a capital commitment that will pay dividends. Students should consider the cost of their education to be a business investment.

Conceptually, it should be possible to set up one national educational fund from which university-managed . . . federally guaranteed loans can be made to responsible individuals at low interest rates. If properly managed, the cost would be little more than the forgiven interest.

I would remind all who are here today—concerned with the impact of these Federal initiatives—that it is up to you—the proponents of higher education—to present your case so convincingly . . . that it will be seen, once again, as part of a vital national agenda.

Here—perhaps more than anywhere else—new realities require new thinking in order to come up with new directions that will work.

At the state level, I'm sure most of you will join me in commending the new initiatives already being proposed, such as the Center at RPI and the statewide Centers of Excellence in technology development.

And, just as important, it's healthy sign when we see New York State leaders exploring other initiatives, such as the creation of a state bonding authority that could float bond issues to provide student loans.

Within the business sector, it's valid for higher education to seek increased support, where possible, from corporations of all sizes. At the same time, I must underscore the impossibility of business being able to "replace" the real and projected cuts in support at the federal level.

Further, let me also point out that I see a great deal of room for creative new directions in college-corporate partnerships.

Some examples that come to mind are: employee reimbursement programs; student-faculty internships; summer co-op employment programs; and on-site teaching courses . . . to name just a few that are already in place at Kodak.

In closing . . . let me leave you, first, with a challenge: That is, to continue the search for new and better ideas to enhance our opportunities for partnership. New and better ideas that will be mutually beneficial and worthwhile. This partnership remains one of the best means we have for coming up with new directions in the face of new realities.

And finally, let me sound a note of optimism—one that captures my central theme that we will emerge from today's challenges even stronger in the future.

It's from a book called *The Enterprising Americans* by John Chamberlain and is close to the essence of our view:

" . . . In the broadest sense, Americans are a people who, looking to government for the performance of certain indispensable functions, nevertheless have put their ultimate faith in their own creative energies . . . For such a people, a new frontier, the real frontier, will always be open."

Thank you.●

THE EL SALVADORAN ARMY—AN OBJECTIVE PORTRAIT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read so much that is critical about the Army of El Salvador that any article that attempts to give us a balanced view deserves wide distribution. I recently came across such an article. It shows that the El Salvadoran Army is poorly equipped, poorly organized and poorly led. But, at the same time, the army is learning new battle tactics and is even given credit for the recent suc-

cessful elections held in that country. The various atrocities that have been traced to parts of the military in El Salvador (and not, for the most part, to the army itself) cannot be condoned. But, at the same time, it is clear that a better trained, better led army in that country can lessen the chances of such atrocities and also help protect the citizens against terrorists of left and right.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Salvadoran Army—The Creaky Machine" by Kenneth Freed of the Los Angeles Times, April 11, 1982.

SALVADORAN ARMY—THE CREAKY MACHINE (By Kenneth Freed)

SAN SALVADOR.—In some armies they talk about spit and polish and a few good men; El Salvador's is characterized by baggy clothes and boys as young as 15.

And while generals the world over are accused of planning for the last war, the military tactics employed here go back to the last century.

When the civil war broke out two years ago, the 22,000 members of the Salvadoran military were untrained, ill-disciplined and poorly equipped.

There has been some improvement, owing in part to instruction provided by an expanded U.S. advisory mission and in part to experience acquired in combat with the guerrilla enemy. But a tour of military bases and interviews with officers, ordinary soldiers and outside experts indicate that the Salvadoran military is still more of a clunker than a well-oiled fighting machine.

The problem begins with recruitment. El Salvador has no draft, but the army is far from being a volunteer force. Many enlisted men say they were forced to join.

In one town recently, a company of soldiers marched in, rounded up all the young men in the central square and picked out several who were to "volunteer" for a two-year tour of duty. No excuses were accepted.

Basic training is brief and informal by American standards.

Some of the new troops are no more than 15 years old; 17 appears to be the average age. Many are barely taller than their rifles, and what uniforms they have are usually too large.

During a visit to the garrison in Santa Ana, El Salvador's second-largest city and a stronghold of government support, reporters watched a batch of recruits being drilled. Few of the men wore complete uniforms; odds and ends of civilian clothing were seen, including a variety of shoes ranging from sneakers to loafers.

The drill field resembled a school playground. Training consisted mostly of running in circles and hopping up and down.

The barracks area was littered with broken equipment. Paper littered the ground and troops lolled about. Living quarters were messy. Dogs and chickens roamed the area.

There were jeeps with broken windshields and other vehicles that were obviously out of service. Although some soldiers went out on patrol in new Ford trucks recently supplied by the United States, most troop carriers were old and battered. Many were ordinary pickup trucks painted in non-military colors.

The Santa Ana garrison is not unique and in many ways is in better condition than several others. The soldiers there are rela-

tively well behaved, and the people in the area seem to respect them.

Inadequate training may help explain the Salvadoran soldier's carelessness with weapons.

Soldiers play casually with their rifles, pointing them in every direction. They keep their fingers constantly on the trigger and often toy with the safety catch, clicking it on and off.

But while the army may seem ragtag, it is considered the most professional of El Salvador's several military and paramilitary forces.

ALSO AIR FORCE, NAVY, LOCAL UNITS

Besides the Army, there is an air force and a navy—altogether about 14,000 men.

There are also the National Guard, the National Police and various security forces, including armed civilians, who make up local defense units. They total about 8,000 men. All are led by regular army officers, but their ranks are trained and equipped even more poorly than the army. And they have a reputation for vicious treatment of the populace.

Several alleged massacres are attributed to these units. Many of the so-called death squads that roam the cities and countryside at night terrorizing the population are made up of National Guardsmen and members of the other security forces.

The National Guard barracks in Suchitoto, in the north of the country, is typical. Here there are three companies, about 150 men in all. The barracks looks more like a tenement than military housing. Clothing and sheets were scattered around filthy rooms. Tablecloths served as doors. Animals were everywhere.

The commander, a captain dressed in dirty, baggy fatigue pants and a grubby T-shirt, apparently had not shaved for several days. As he talked with reporters, a squad of soldiers entered, tossed their guns carelessly on a table and wandered off to eat. Nobody saluted or reported or gave any sign of respect to the officer.

At another unit, reportedly one of the best in the army, equipment is lacking, many soldiers are without uniforms and discipline is casual at best. This unit, a battalion, is located in the northeast province of Cabanas and is commanded by Lt. Col. Sigifredo Ochoa, one of the most respected officers in the army.

Last month Ochoa ran an operation designed to push a large band of guerrillas out of his area, a drive that was considered largely successful.

When asked about the large number of his men—boys, really—who were dressed in jeans and T-shirts, Ochoa said, "We don't have enough uniforms."

He also complained that he has only one helicopter to move troops, and he said he does not like the fact that his men carry different types of rifles. Some carry M-16s, the standard weapon in the U.S. Army; others have G-3 assault rifles, made in Belgium and West Germany and issued to West European forces.

"The ammunition isn't compatible," Ochoa said, "and it is very difficult for the men in the field since they can't exchange ammunition under fire."

OUTDATED TACTICS A SERIOUS SHORTCOMING

His operation, although thought of as a good one, also pointed up what military observers consider a serious weakness—the use of old-fashioned and limited tactics.

So far, the army has done little more than react defensively and carry out an occasion-

al sweep of suspected guerrilla territory, pulling out afterward. The guerrillas, who are more mobile, usually disappear before the well-advertised sweep begins or retreat through the army lines, taking minimum casualties.

Touring Salvadoran army bases is like watching an American cavalry-and-Indians movie. The troops hole up in fortresses in the towns, foraging out during the day to patrol the main highways. At night, the countryside belongs to the guerrillas, who roam freely, raiding hamlets for food, medicine and recruits. They also attack the two- or three-man teams left to guard bridges, often destroying the bridges.

While the army still occupies the major cities, several important towns are virtually cut off, and only the bravest—or most foolhardy—travel at night.

Most observers estimate that fully one-third of El Salvador is effectively under guerrilla control. But that may be changing, along with other things.

A 50-man U.S. military advisory group is in El Salvador to train the troops, to teach new tactics and turn the army into a professional fighting force.

Already the Salvadorans have formed a special battalion that uses more modern tactics, is better equipped and certainly appears more professional. But the Atlacatl Battalion, as it is called, is still mostly a defensive unit, its 1,000 men often split up to fend off the most serious guerrilla attacks.

Military observers say a more offensive strategy will come after a special unit of 1,500 men and officers now in training in the United States returns. An example of what that is expected to mean came during the recent election, when the army discouraged an expected guerrilla offensive aimed at disrupting the voting.

Instead of merely waiting in their fortresses, patrols were sent out at night to ambush the guerrillas, particularly around San Salvador. The general result was that the leftists were kept off balance and never had an opportunity to reach the cities.

According to a key military observer, the army was responsible for the successful elections, and that gave the troops a tremendous boost in morale.

All the experts here seem to agree that the army is not in any immediate danger of losing the war. But it is "still a step short of winning it," one said.

The American training program will turn out nearly 500 new officers, and that should ease the key shortage of field leaders.

According to the experts, though, all the training is aimed at the army, and that is not enough. The National Guard and the other security forces are needed if the war is to be won, one military observer said, and the American training program does not include them. ●

SOVIET UNION'S THREATS AND PROMISES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention has been paid to the question of the nuclear arms freeze and the end to the total arms race. While this is a goal that all na-

tions would hope to see, we must logically look at the Soviet Union and its past apparent threats and broken promises.

A very pertinent editorial which appeared in the Southtown Economist Newspaper, of April 8, was right on target on this subject. I insert this editorial from the Southtown Economist which serves suburban Chicago, Ill.

The editorial follows for the attention of the Members:

SOVIET'S 'NUCLEAR BRINKSMANSHIP' POSES A DANGER

The threat was made casually enough.

Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev reiterated his proposal for a freeze on missiles in Europe. In a talk opening the 17th congress of Soviet trade unions, he said that the deployment of new American missiles in Europe, as planned by NATO, would pose a threat to the Soviet Union.

Then he added:

"This would compel us to take retaliatory steps that would put the other side, including the United States itself, its own territory, in an analogous position. This should not be forgotten."

The U.S. Embassy in Moscow played down the importance of the warning. Diplomats said the Soviet Union had made such "rather vague threats" before. Later, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger described the threat as a "very obscure, ambiguous sort of phrase."

Then the threat was reiterated, in the same vague terms, by two Soviet officials. Valentin Falin, first deputy chief of the Communist Party Central Committee's International Information Department, and Lt. Gen. Nikolai Chervov, chief of the Department of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., appeared on Moscow television March 27.

"It (referring to the United States) is bringing the danger closer to itself," Falin said with reference to the NATO missile plan.

"In the U.S.A., they probably entertain illusions that they are invulnerable, separated by two oceans," Chervov said. "At present, however, distances must be evaluated differently, differently in the sense that, by moving a threat closer to others, the U.S.A. is in the same manner bringing it closer to itself."

Does this talk hint at a Soviet plan to station medium-range ballistic missiles in Cuba? Apparently, but the threat hasn't got that specific so far.

In 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union went eyeball to eyeball over this very issue and the Soviets blinked.

Some historians believe the fact that the Soviets had to back down in 1962 is what has motivated their buildup in naval forces and strategic weapons since that date. In any case, they are far stronger in comparison to the United States now than they were then. In a new Cuban missile crisis, it is unlikely that they would back down as quickly, if at all.

The veiled threat of a new Cuban missile crisis may have been made, as diplomats believe, merely to strengthen the anti-nuclear-war movement in Europe and the United States.

But the fact that the Kremlin would make it, even in such an obscure way, is enough to give us pause. It is a kind of nuclear brinksmanship that is extremely dangerous. ●

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a resolution recently adopted by the Philadelphia City Council regarding public hearings on preparations for civil defense in nuclear war. Last October the Philadelphia City Council joined councils, legislatures, and town meetings throughout the Nation in calling for a mutual and immediate freeze on nuclear weaponry. Pursuant to the policies of the Reagan administration on the civil defense issue, the city of Philadelphia is engaged in costly planning and preparation for civil defense and evacuation of the region in the event of a nuclear war, yet the council believes that any evacuation in such an emergency would be futile and chaotic. For this reason the council is now planning public hearings to expose the probable medical and environmental effects of a nuclear holocaust in the Philadelphia region. I commend the city council for this important resolution.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 695

Resolution to hold public hearings on preparations for civil defense in nuclear war and to memorialize President Ronald Reagan and Congress to provide essential funding for the needs of the cities

Whereas, The City Council of Philadelphia on March 5, 1981 passed Resolution 433 memorializing President Ronald Reagan and Congress "to prevent the projected budget cuts that will cause untold suffering to older cities like Philadelphia"; and

Whereas, The City Council of Philadelphia on October 22, 1981 passed Resolution 609 memorializing President Ronald Reagan and Congress "to persist in seeking a mutual and immediate freeze on nuclear weaponry with the Soviet Union and other nations"; and

Whereas, The City of Philadelphia is engaged in planning and preparation for civil defense and evacuation of the region in the event of a nuclear war at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars in 1982; and

Whereas, Leading scientists, physicians and military experts point out the futility of protecting civilian populations from the enormously destructive and long-term effects of nuclear weapons and nuclear war; and

Whereas, Conservative casualty estimates by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for a single one-megaton nuclear explosion over Philadelphia indicate that seven hundred sixty-nine thousand people would be killed promptly and another one million three hundred thirty-four thousand would be severely wounded and most medical care facilities destroyed; and

Whereas, In a nuclear war, Philadelphia could be hit by ten or more one-megaton bombs with as little as fifteen minutes advance warning; and

Whereas, The evacuation of civilians under the threat of an imminent nuclear attack would be futile and would likely lead to chaos and additional suffering; and

Whereas, The United States has some thirty thousand nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union some twenty thousand nuclear weapons, a fraction of which could devastate either country. During the next decade the superpowers are planning to build over twenty thousand new nuclear weapons; and

Whereas, This unprecedented arms buildup will cost Philadelphia area residents and businesses over thirty-two billion dollars in taxes over the next five years at a time when federal funds for cities, schools, health care, mass transit, energy, housing, employment and economic institutions are being drastically cut; and

Whereas, Congress recently voted about two hundred billion dollars for the 1982 military budget, and President Ronald Reagan is requesting a further increase of thirty-three billion dollars in military spending for 1983 and a further cut of twenty-six billion dollars in domestic and social programs, while projecting a national deficit of ninety-eight and six-tenths billion dollars for fiscal 1982 and ninety-one and five-tenths billion dollars in 1983; therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That the City Council will hold public hearings on preparations for civil defense in nuclear war with expert testimony regarding the numbers, variety and destructive power of nuclear arms, the probable fallout patterns and the lasting effects of radiation, the effect of fire storms in removing oxygen and rendering shelters useless, and the anticipated effects on the atmosphere and the environment possibly leading to universal blindness and the destruction of plant, animal and insect life.

Resolved, further, that City Council memorialize President Ronald Reagan and Congress to cut the military budget and eliminate the waste estimated between ten billion dollars and thirty billion dollars in military spending to provide essential funding for the desperate human service needs of the cities.●

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE UKRAINE

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 205, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to violations of human rights by the Soviet Union in the Ukraine. Time and time again I am reminded of the Soviet failure to live up to their commitments under the Helsinki accords. At this very moment, the people of the Ukraine are being denied certain fundamental human rights which were supposedly guaranteed when the U.S.S.R. agreed to cosign the Helsinki pact back in 1975. I firmly believe that this situation must not be permitted to continue without impressing upon the Kremlin the Free World's firm resolve against oppression. Only through such

expressions of dissatisfaction can we possibly hope to make our position clear. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 205 and, in so doing, informing the Soviets of our awareness as to their flagrant human rights violations in the Ukraine.●

THE HIGH COST OF WEAPONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting my Washington report for Wednesday, April 7, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE HIGH COST OF WEAPONS

The process by which the United States government buys weapons for the nation's defense must be improved substantially. If it is not, then in my judgment Congress and the American public will not continue to support higher levels of military spending. Congress and the President must work together both to get a grip on defense costs and to demonstrate that weapons can be acquired efficiently and within budget.

Because of the importance of preserving the present consensus in favor of a stronger defense, the high cost of weaponry is emerging as a primary concern of the 97th Congress. It has become critical to national security that the cost of weapons be controlled. To get the cost under control, we must first understand why it is rising rapidly and why there is much waste and inefficiency in the process of buying weapons. Then we must take specific steps to improve that process.

Many factors converge to cause waste and inefficiency in the purchase of weapons. Legislators maneuver vigorously to protect employment for people back home by keeping outdated defense installations open and by forcing the military to buy weapons it does not want. Defense industry executives use political "clout" to protect their firms from competition. Also, they know how to take advantage of the fact that once a weapon has been accepted, it is likely to be around for many years to come. Legions of lobbyists flock to Congress to support particular weapon systems. Inter-service rivalries drive up the cost of weaponry, too. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all strive to maintain separate acquisition systems despite the savings of consolidation. Fraud and theft skim millions of dollars off the procurement budget each year. Some errors in the management of a \$65-billion budget should be expected, but the many incidents reported in the press serve only to confirm our fears. The Pentagon itself routinely underestimates the cost of new weapons and gains Congress' approval of them in part because of their "low cost", knowing that Congress will not retaliate against high cost later by killing a half-finished program.

The high cost of weaponry is due to several factors, among which are the design of weapons (for example, technological complexity and the failure to standardize the weapons among the services), management and budget practices (for example, overruns in costs, uncertain budgetary projections, and lack of competition), and inefficiencies

in the defense industry (for example, bottlenecks, low productivity, and labor shortages). When the cost of weapons is underestimated, the extension of the completion time cancels the economies of mass production, the cost of high technology, while not waste, drives up the procurement budget as well.

There is no doubt that the growth in the cost of weapons has been staggering. Aircraft today cost 25 times more than they did in World War II; armored vehicles and ships cost ten times more. A nuclear carrier costs \$3 billion without its complement of aircraft; a battle tank costs \$2.5 million; a field gun, \$350,000; an attack submarine, \$580 million. Our top fighter aircraft, the F15, has a \$33 million price tag.

For years, the problem of the rising cost of weapons has been studied with much care. Many proposals to streamline the acquisition process and lower the cost of weaponry have been made. Correctly recognizing that the pro-defense consensus in the country could be undermined and destroyed by the exorbitant cost of weapons, President Reagan has made a number of proposals to reduce costs. Among the proposals are the following:

- Broader use of multi-year funding;
- Production of weapons at more efficient rates;
- Full funding of programs to maintain their stability;
- Better estimates of costs and inflation rates;
- Reduction in the number of defense directives;
- Relief from burdensome government regulations;
- More competition among defense producers;
- Greater use of standardized weapons systems; and
- Modernization of defense plant equipment.

The total amount to be saved through the Reagan Administration's proposals depends on the vigor with which the proposals are pursued. Some experts believe that 10 percent of the procurement budget could eventually be saved. However, quick savings cannot be expected from procurement reforms. It will take several years before significant savings can be realized.

All sides in the defense debate agree on the need to lower the cost of weapons. The Reagan Administration is making a concerted effort to do so. It deserves strong support in Congress as it presses forward in the worthy effort.

NOTE.—Some data for this newsletter were drawn from a recent report by Robert Foelber entitled "Cutting The High Cost Of Weapons".●

ALFRED P. CHAMIE—STATE OF ISRAEL TRIBUTE DINNER

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1982, at the State of Israel tribute dinner saluting the film industry of California, Alfred P. Chamie will receive the Torch of Freedom

Award for his work on behalf of men and women of all faiths.

A long-time resident of the State of California, Alfred P. Chamie was born in New York. He attended school in California, receiving his A.B. degree at the University of California in 1931. After receiving his LL.B. from Harvard University, he was admitted to the California bar and the Supreme Court bar in 1934.

Alfred P. Chamie served his country with honor and distinction as a member of the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946. He continued his involvement with military matters serving as a member and chairman of the California Veterans Board from 1952 to 1961; a member of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive office of the President; a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission; a member of the National Jobs for Veterans Commission. As an active member of the American Legion, Alfred P. Chamie served as the California commander, 1959, the national executive commander, 1959-60 and the national commander in 1970-71. He has also been a long-time trustee of the American Legion Hollywood Canteen fund.

His other memberships include the Community Relations Committee of the Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council, the Jewish War Veterans, the Masons, the Elks, and the B'nai B'rith.

Alfred P. Chamie became an integral part of the California film industry when he joined the Association of the Motion Picture Producers, Inc., Los Angeles, in 1948 as legal counsel. Mr. Chamie rose to the eminent position of general counsel of the Association of Motion Picture and TV Producers (AMPTP) and served in this capacity from 1958 to 1978. He earned the respect and confidence of his associates and colleagues in the film industry and assumed additional responsibilities serving as trustee for the contract service administration fund; the motion picture industry pension plan; the Writers Guild pension industrial welfare plans; the Directors Guild pension plan; the Screen Actors Guild pension and welfare funds, and the board of directors of the motion picture and TV fund. In addition, he continues to serve as a member and was former president of the Mayor's Film Development Commission.

On the evening of Israel's 34th anniversary celebration, the film industry of California is receiving special acknowledgment for its work in challenging and exposing the forces of bigotry, hatred, terrorism, and exploitation. Alfred P. Chamie represents the finest in the industry's tradition.

I ask the Members to join me in saluting Alfred P. Chamie for a lifetime of service to his community, State, and Nation. We share the pride of his colleagues and family—his wife, Eliza-

beth, and children, Denise and Peter, in his accomplishments. May he have many more years of success and fulfillment. ●

THE VIETNAMESE GULAG

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those who welcomed an American and South Vietnamese defeat in Vietnam, those who told us our participation in that war was "immoral," owe it to us to tell us how much they like the current Vietnam that their hard work helped to make.

At this point I want to insert in the RECORD "The Vietnamese Gulag" and "Daily Life in Vietnam's 'Reeducation' Camps," from the Wall Street Journal, April 8, 1982.

THE VIETNAMESE GULAG

Elsewhere on this page appear lengthy excerpts from a State Department report on Vietnam's so-called "reeducation camps." The report was compiled over a period of a year or so from interviews with Vietnamese refugees, and appears in abbreviated form in the State Department's forthcoming annual report on human rights.

The interviews weren't conducted in accordance with Miranda rules of evidence; they are subject to the distortions of memory and the biases of both interviewer and interviewee; and they no doubt can be found wrong, contradictory and exaggerated on certain points. Overall, however, the report confirms what some observers of Indochina have feared for some time: that the Vietnamese have established their very own gulag.

The picture of this gulag as it emerges from the excerpts nearby isn't for the faint-hearted: starvation diets, beatings, torture and summary executions on a wide and systematic scale. Repression and slave labor, not "reeducation," seem to be the real point of the camps. Many are shot down in cold blood for attempting to escape; others tell of bribing their way out with money or sexual favors.

Intelligence sources and State Department officials say the camps are still going strong. Most estimates place the gulag population at between 100,000 and 200,000. All of the ex-prisoners quoted in the excerpts said that they were in the camps as recently as 1980-81.

The reeducation camps don't appear to have yet approached the ferocity of the Soviet gulag, where tens of millions lost their lives in post-revolutionary Russia. But that may only be because the Vietnamese have found other, even more deadly, means of ridding themselves of enemies of the state—including the exodus of the boat people, when tens of thousands were drowned or died of exposure on the open seas as they attempted to flee their persecutors. And the Vietnamese gulag, it's now clear, consists of more than concentration camps. "New Economic Zones" have been established in the hinterlands to which undesirables are forced to relocate as virtual slave labor. Many refugees say that condi-

tions in the zones are as harsh and mortality as high as in the camps.

There are also reports that at least 50,000 Vietnamese have been shipped off to the original gulag—Siberia—and other places in the Soviet Union and East Bloc to labor in mines and factories. Vietnamese emigres say preparations are being made for hundreds of thousands more to follow.

In this fashion, State Department and intelligence sources believe, the Vietnamese and Soviets may be trying to solve several problems at once. Exporting labor alleviates unemployment in Vietnam itself and helps the Soviets cope with their current manpower shortages. Up to 60% of the earnings of the Vietnamese laborers is reportedly confiscated to help pay off Vietnam's large and growing debt to the Soviets. And though there is some indication that so far the workers have been "volunteers," in the sense that even life in the Soviet gulag is preferable to life in Vietnam these days, there have also been reports that the workers are being drawn from reeducation camps or are being assigned on the basis of class and affiliation with the former Saigon government.

There is a temptation to dismiss such reports as overwrought. But the Vietnamese themselves last year disclosed that they had signed "labor agreements" with the Soviet Union, East Germany, Bulgaria and others for "training" programs for Vietnamese workers. The World Confederation of Labor has requested that the UN investigate the arrangements, and Sen. William Armstrong, Republican of Colorado, says he plans to call for hearings on whether slave labor, including the Vietnamese, is being used to construct the gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe.

In any case, it's clear that the Vietnamese Communists are already living up to the worst that was feared of them before they "liberated" the south. At that time many of America's opinion molders were busily assuring us that these were really stout-hearted reformers whose main purpose in life was to bring peace to the country and teach illiterates to read.

As late as 1979, for example, the New York Times ran a story straight forwardly repeating Hanoi's bald lie that only "several thousand" people were being held in the camps "largely for their own protection," presumably from the angered revolutionary masses. That figure was upped to 20,000 last year when Amnesty International issued a report calling for the close-down of the camps—a twentyfold increase that was still at least five times too small. And Neil Sheehan, a Vietnam war reporter, in 1980 wrote a long article that depicted a reeducation camp as a primitive sort of college campus where the student worked hard but studied as advertised.

The Vietnamese gulag is deserving of our horror in its own right. It should also be remembered as we read of "revolutionaries" elsewhere who mouth social-democratic pieties while preparing to bring their brand of "peace" to the societies they are terrorizing.

DAILY LIFE IN VIETNAM'S "REEDUCATION" CAMPS

The following are excerpts from reports on Vietnamese "reeducation camps" compiled by personnel from the U.S. Embassy in Thailand. The unclassified reports are based on interviews last year with more than 60 refugees who fled Vietnam in 1980-81. The interviews are continuing.

Embassy and State Department officials estimate that there are at least 50 reeducation camps in Vietnam holding more than 126,000 captives, most of them political prisoners. The reports describe conditions in 14 such camps and portray a systematic pattern of privation, beatings and summary executions.

An editorial on this subject appears on this page. The subtitles in the material below are the names of the camps.

GIA RA Z30

Two Vietnamese refugees reported having been incarcerated in a reeducation camp at Gia Ra Z-30. . . . Reports of refugees held in the camp place the prisoner population at 4,000. The camp is located in the District of Xuan Loc in Dong Nai (Long Khanh) Province.

Physical Description: A brick wall surrounds the camp, beyond which are three barbed wire fences and one wooden fence. . . . Prisoners are locked inside their detention houses at 1800 hours. Mobile guards roam the camp at night. . . . One source said that camp authorities allow prisoners one liter of potable water per day.

Categories of Prisoners: Prisoners include: political prisoners, former ARVN military personnel and civilian officials working for the previous regime at the local or central level. Among the political prisoners are Roman Catholic priests and members of political parties.

Identification of Camp Officials: Camp commander is Public Security Lt. Col. Trinn Van Thich. Deputy commander is "Pre-Captain" Phung. . . .

Conditions at Camp: Prisoners' diet consists of the following: Breakfast: one bowl of hard corn or sliced cassava; Lunch: rice mixed with sliced manioc or corn; Supper: two bowls of sliced cassava or sweet potato, or corn without rice, plus salted water or salt. Occasionally prisoners receive salted or spoiled fish. Subcamp "Khu-B" has a first aid station. "Khu-A" and "Khu-C" have dispensaries though "Khu-C" lacks medicines and equipment. Prisoners work eight hours per day clearing forest land, cutting wood and farming. One source reported 20 deaths due to a lack of medication (time frame not specified). Deaths also resulted from mine explosions and from executions and from executions by camp authorities. Guards generally prohibited conversation among prisoners.

Reports of Inhumane Treatment: Camp authorities have placed prisoners in stocks in dark cells and beaten them to death. Guards strike prisoners with rifle butts. Guards use sticks wrapped in cloth to hit prisoners on the chest. Guards also punish prisoners by cutting food rations. Guards have carried out executions. That Van Hiep, an ARVN sergeant, was shot to death for his "struggle against hard labor in the farming fields. . . ."

HAM TAN Z30D

Eight Vietnamese refugees reported having been incarcerated in a reeducation camp at Ham Tan Z30D. . . . Refugees place the prisoner population at approximately 4,000. The camp is located in the District of Ham Tan in Thuan Hai Province, near DA Mai village. . . .

Physical Description: There are nine separate areas comprising a total of 17 compounds. The camp area is surrounded by three barriers: a thick wall of bamboo, a barbed wire fence supported by steel poles and a three-meter-wide trench. . . . Conditions are very unsanitary. Human waste is

collected daily in the camp for use in fertilizing camp gardens. Water is drawn from a stream described as "very, very dirty." Prisoners are given one and one-half liters of boiled water daily.

Categories of Prisoners: The prison population comprises former ARVN military officers and NCOs, RVN civilian bureaucrats, politicians under the previous regime, religious leaders including Buddhist, Christian and Hoa Hao sects, resistance personnel, civil criminals and "political prisoners. . . ."

Conditions at Camp: Diet consists of manioc, yams, some vegetables and rice. Meat and fish are rarely provided. . . . Prisoners must work eight hours per day, seven days per week. Work includes: clearing jungle, cutting trees, camp construction and farming. Common causes of death are execution, illness such as malnutrition and labor accidents.

Reports and Inhumane Treatment: Prisoners report several instances of torture. ARVN Capt. Nguyen Van Thu was shackled and beaten until his teeth were broken and he vomited blood. Nguyen Duy Gia, identified as a "former Tokyo bank director" over 60 years old, was placed in stocks in March-April 1979. . . . "Restoration Movement" prisoners are placed in "dark cells," their feet are shackled, and they are forced to lie on the floor with their legs raised up against a wooden beam. Guards regularly beat prisoners.

GIA TRUNG

Conditions at Camp: Each subcamp has a dispensary which uses Oriental medicines. Prisoners are served three meals daily which consist of: breakfast-manioc, sweet potato or corn; lunch—rice with salt and some vegetable; dinner—rice or sweet potatoes and vegetables; amounting to approximately 15 kg. of staple food per prisoner, per month. Prisoners work eight hours per day, seven days per week clearing jungle, digging fish ponds and planting vegetables. Nighttime study sessions focus on self-criticism, government policies and Communist Party history. Common causes of death include malnutrition, suicide, "being shot down. . . ."

TAN HIEP

Ten Vietnamese refugees reported having been incarcerated in a reeducation camp at Tan Hiep (Suoi Mau). . . .

Physical Description: The camp comprises five subcamps. There is also a hard labor camp named Trang Bom. The site was formerly used by the Republic of Vietnam (RVN) to hold North Vietnamese Army (NVA) prisoners. The camp comprises approximately 25 buildings which are concrete-walled, have tin roofs and dirt or concrete floors. Multiple barbed wire fences surround the camp. . . .

Reports of Inhumane Treatment: Refugees report that punishment for "careless talk" or camp rule infractions includes beating and shackling inside connex boxes in the sun without water. Christmas 1978, 400 prisoners staged a demonstration against the camp authorities. The 400 were reportedly tortured, sent to Chi Hoa Prison in Ho Chi Minh City and then to Phu Khanh Province. Former ARVN Capt. Nguyen Thanh Long, according to two separate reports, was accused of having attempted to contact the Vietnamese resistance. He was beaten by four to six men and shackled inside a connex. In March 1978, he committed suicide. ARVN Major Bui Huu Nghia was suspected of being a leader of resistance inside the camp. Cadre shackled him for three

months, after which he died. Refugees report that prisoners were shot during escape attempts or after being caught. In the 1975-77 period, two ARVN majors were given a one-hour "trial" by camp authorities following an escape attempt and then shot. In the 1977-78 period, ARVN 1st Lt. Nguyen Khoa Bong was "shot down" by guards in an escape attempt. Guards shot Marine Lieutenant Nguyen Ngoc Bun in a September 1980 escape attempt. In the 1975-76 period, guards shackled Catholic priest Father Thanh for 15 days following his escape attempt. Finally, a secondhand report states that in April 1980, cadre discovered former ARVN Airborne Public Affairs Officer Nguyen Xuan kept a diary regarding his imprisonment which he intended to smuggle out of the camp. He was shackled inside a connex and tortured for three months. . . .

NGHE TINH

Conditions for Release: K-1 prisoner claimed that 50 prisoners were released every three months. K-2 prisoner said that prisoners were released on order of the "National Security Department." K-3 prisoner paid 5 taels of gold for his release.

VUON DAO

Conditions at camp: By December 1979, the diet consisted of 500 grams per day of a mixture of rice/sorghum/wheat with very limited amounts of meat, fish and vegetables. By early 1980, diet consisted of either a small bowl of sorghum or a 100-gram piece of bread, twice per day, very limited vegetables and salt water. . . . Prisoners sometimes worked on local farms for which local farmers paid cadre, who pocketed the money.

Reports of Inhumane Treatment: . . . guards place prisoners in connexes and beat them with rifles and sticks. Following beatings, guards reportedly place prisoners in cell measuring 2x2x2 meters, allowing them only one liter of water per day for washing and drinking and a small quantity of boiled rice. Lt. Col. Nguyen Duc Xich, Gia Dinh province chief and an inspector general (appointed by President Thieu), was confined in cell four months, then held in a connex container for two months. He was eventually "shot down" without trial for an alleged escape attempt. . . .

Conditions for Release: Refugees state 150 prisoners were released in the 1977-79 period. Officially, authorities said that those released had done well in reeducation. Refugees claim however that releases came on the basis of bribes including prisoners' wives bestowing sexual favors on the camp commander. Some lower ranking officers were released on "humanitarian grounds."

CAY CAY (BAU DO)

Reports of Inhumane Treatment: People who make "mistakes," or who are "reluctant workers" or who make jokes about the regime are beaten up and tortured: "Both legs of victim are locked up with both hands tied on a bamboo stick with face down day and night. The inmate with free hands next to the victim can feed him during mealtime." Hoang Quy, 1st Lt. ARVN and a former seminarian, was suspected of saying mass for Christian prisoners. Cadre "locked up his legs" from July 1977 until October 1978.

Conditions for Release: Former prisoners note that prisoners are released on basis of family connections with high ranking Communist officials, payment of bribes and having served for a long time. One prisoner noted that lower ranking prisoners gained

release earlier than prisoners who have higher ranks (in the previous government). One prisoner noted that he had heard from guards in 1978 that a significant number of prisoners would be set free so as to provide more room to incarcerate people trying to escape Vietnam. . . .

LEST WE FORGET

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 39th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. This very important date commemorates the heroism and extraordinary courage exhibited by the Jewish freedom fighters of eastern Poland in 1943 in resisting the Nazi occupation of their homeland.

On April 19, 1943, under the leadership of Mordecai Anielewicz, the Jewish people of Muranow, Poland, revolted against their Nazi oppressors by making use of their very limited arsenal in retaliation against Hitler's occupation forces in Warsaw. This courageous attempt to fight back against Nazi tyranny initially caught the Nazi forces off guard, and making use of these rudimentary weapons, were able to hold back the Nazi tanks for weeks. But their valiant efforts met with tragedy 42 days later, when their ghetto community was totally destroyed and its surviving residents were sent off to the most infamous concentration camps. In all, more than 50,000 courageous Jews gave up their lives in this resistance effort.

This unforgettable event was commemorated all over the United States yesterday, and among those groups honoring the Warsaw freedom fighters were many congregations in the 29th Congressional District of New York, which I represent. These ceremonies were marked by the reading of poignant testimonies written by those who witnessed the inhumane cruelty and suffering inflicted by the most murderous and oppressive regime the world has ever known.

The heroism and strength of the Warsaw freedom fighters and the Jewish people of World War II in general will never be forgotten, and will serve as a standard for those struggling against oppression everywhere.●

WILLIAM J. VENTURI

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to honor Mr. Wil-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

liam J. Venturi, a man whose commitment to serving the people of Madera County deserves special recognition. On the March 31, Mr. Venturi will leave his post as veterans' service officer, to which he was appointed by the county board of supervisors in 1947. In his 32 years of service, he has assisted many thousands of veterans, widows, and dependent children in their efforts to receive compensations and pensions, as well as benefits covering education, hospitalization, and other medical needs.

Mr. Venturi was born in Madera, where his parents made their first home after emigrating from Italy. He graduated from local schools then attended Fresno City College and Fresno State College to study business administration. In 1942, during the Second World War, Mr. Venturi enlisted in the Air Force. After being trained on various bases scattered throughout the Southwestern United States, Mr. Venturi boarded a ship to serve in New Guinea, Dutch Hollandia, and the Admiralty Islands in the South Pacific. He was discharged from the service at McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento in 1945, after having earned the rank of sergeant.

Two years later Mr. Venturi launched his distinguished career as a veterans' service officer, but his commitment to community service was by no means confined to this office. His leadership qualities were evidenced throughout his four terms as city councilman and two terms as mayor of Madera. He also has to his credit a record of dedicated service to a number of civic organizations. Mr. Venturi is a past president of both the State Veterans' Service Officers and the Southern Valley Division of the League of Cities, a past commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, a past chairman of LAFCO, and a committee member for the Boy Scouts of America. He is currently a member of the Rotary Club, a charter member of the Madera Elks Lodge, and chairman of the Council on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we have the opportunity to salute such untiring dedication to community service. It is with pride that I wish to recognize Mr. Venturi's extraordinary contributions to the people of Madera County. His extensive involvement and community spirit serve as inspiration to us all.●

DOMINICAN SISTERS OF
SPRINGFIELD, ILL. SPEAK OUT
ON GUATEMALA

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, events continue to go from bad to worse in Guatemala. The recent elections did nothing to improve the situation in that tragic nation and now, of course, with the coup, the circumstances for the people of Guatemala are even more discouraging.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the great concern which exists in this country about the situation in Guatemala. In particular, the Sacred Heart Convent of the Dominican Sisters, Springfield, Ill., passed a resolution on March 2, 1982, calling upon the President and the Congress to enforce human rights sanctions against Guatemala and not to provide any military assistance to Guatemala. This resolution was sent to me by Mother M. Dominica Brennan and the Sisters of the Convent.

This resolution was extremely thoughtful and demonstrates sincere humanitarian concern for the people of Guatemala.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. PETER J.
ANSELMO

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, with heavy hearts and a sense of deep loss, the people of southern Maryland regretfully note the demise of Mr. Peter J. Anselmo. The long time resident of Waldorf, Md., passed away March 28 in LaPlata, Md. He was a man of selfless devotion, who for decades dedicated his talents and energies to the community and Nation he loved.

Peter Anselmo spent the majority of his working life in service to our country. During World War II he was employed at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington, D.C., while simultaneously serving with the Washington, D.C., Policy Reserve. He distinguished himself in both endeavors, becoming president of the Association of Federal Employees at the gun works, and a lieutenant in the police reserve. From there he moved to the Federal Bureau of Engraving, where at the time of his retirement he had risen to become Chief of the Supply and Property Branch.

Mr. Anselmo's greatest contributions, though, were directly to his

local community. He was a loyal member of the Bryantown Council Knights of Columbus, and St. Peters Parish in Waldorf. He was also president of the Knoxhill Citizens Association, and a board member of the Charrington Neighborhood Association for many years. His concern for the young of his community was expressed through his management of the Knoxhill Little League.

Peter Anselmo was also solely responsible for organizing the annual Memorial Day service in Carrington, Md., to date, the only service of its kind in southern Maryland.

All these contributions notwithstanding, Mr. Anselmo's patriotism was best exemplified by the simple, repetitious act of raising and lowering a flag, a duty he discharged faithfully for many years at St. Charles Church, until Congress passed a law allowing it to fly at night—not very glamorous, but then patriots seldom are.

Mr. Anselmo is survived by his wife, Helen, and their three sons. He will long be remembered by his family, his friends, and the community on which he left his distinctive mark.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, as we go about our daily business, it is all too easy to forget that less than 40 years ago millions of innocent Europeans were being sent to their deaths in a planned, systematic manner. Because we so often forget, this week has been designated "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust" by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust is a time to consider what can happen when totalitarians are able to seize control of the apparatus of a modern state. The Nazis used modern techniques of propaganda and terror to mold the fears of ordinary people into an efficient, rationalized death machine. While we mourn for the victims of the Nazi terror and we recognize the brave acts of defiance that many of them committed, we also acknowledge that its causes are alive today. The world of 1982 is full of religious and racial hatred. Many people still suffer from the same totalitarian delusion that inspired Hitler; the belief that utopia will be reached as soon as the last enemy is destroyed.

Some people have argued that we insult the memory of the victims of the Holocaust by discussing it in relation to contemporary events. I certainly would not claim that anything ap-

proaching the scale or severity of the Nazi terror is being carried out today, nor would I want to see the word genocide applied to every act of mass repression. I would, however, like to take this occasion to remind my colleagues that antisemitism—one of the primary passions which fueled the Holocaust—is in evidence today in many parts of the world. Small Jewish populations in Ethiopia, Poland, and Syria, as well as the large Jewish populations of the Soviet Union and Argentina are today subjected to severe pressure. The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith recently reported a significant rise in antisemitic episodes here in the United States.

Perhaps even more alarming than these individual and State-sponsored examples of antisemitism is the emergence of a group of historical revisionists who claim that the Holocaust never happened. Numerous publications literally claim that the Holocaust was a nonexistent hoax fabricated by an international conspiracy. I am not talking about the scribbles of individual lunatics. I am talking about well-financed, well-distributed publications, some of which feature endorsements by Members of Congress. The effort to deny the existence of the Holocaust—despite overwhelming proof—is the ultimate insult to the memory of the Holocaust victims, and a great danger to the liberty and human rights of future generations. If these attempts to rewrite history exist now—less than 40 years after the liberation of the concentration camps—how much influence will such crackpot theories have when all the survivors and witnesses are dead?

Clearly, those of us of the post-Holocaust generation must not allow the suffering of our parents and our grandparents to be forgotten. It is in the spirit of remembrance for the victims—and vigilance against future atrocities—that we mark the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.●

GROUND ZERO WEEK

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, nothing so concentrates the mind as the prospect of nuclear annihilation. Sharing that same concentrated thought are hundreds of thousands of mainstream Americans—our parents, our children, and our neighbors.

A Gallup poll, taken in September of 1981, stated that 65 percent of the American people are concerned about the possibility of nuclear war; 68 percent believe there is a chance of an all-out nuclear war between the United

States and the Soviet Union within the next 10 years. Only 9 percent believe that they would have a good chance of surviving an all-out nuclear war.

The official word is that we and our adversaries are arming in the name of national security. But the deed, when done, portends global destruction.

Nuclear war is the ultimate horror. And its threat, to turn the globe into a ball of cinder and to extinguish all living species, grows by leaps and bounds each day.

It is time we do our part to stop this deadly foolishness, to confront that horror and put the fate of the Earth—our fate—back in our hands.

It is time we begin answering the questions our constituents are asking, and responding to their very real concerns about nuclear war, rather than simply repeating the information that the experts think they need.

To educate the American people about nuclear war—that is the purpose of this special week, Ground Zero Week.

Ground Zero is a nationwide organization which takes its name from the point of detonation of a nuclear weapon.

Ground Zero was conceived by a small bipartisan group of people who were concerned with the lack of a national consensus and direction on nuclear war. They believe that a program of public education on this pressing issue is a matter of utmost priority.

Beginning last Sunday, April 18 until April 25, Ground Zero is sponsoring and coordinating community activities around the Nation. At 1 minute after Midnight on Sunday, a bicycle marathon was scheduled in Champaign, Ill., to demonstrate to the residents that a nuclear strike on the nearby Minuteman missile base would cause the deaths of at least half the people living in that area.

On Monday, signs and markers warning of the dangers of nuclear war were posted along the route of the Boston Marathon, which was being run that day.

We once said that we built the bomb in the name of peace. Now, with the help of Ground Zero, let us build peace in the name of the bomb.

Judy Mann of the Washington Post wrote a timely article, April 16, 1982, on the activities of Ground Zero. I would like to share it now with my esteemed colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1982]

NUCLEAR WAR

(By Judy Mann)

Thanks to the Reagan administration, the unthinkable is now thinkable, which means a phenomenal amount of thinking needs to get done.

Up until now, most of us have stuck the possibility of nuclear war away in the fourth dimension and left the ultimate horror up to the politicians, the scientists

and engineers, the intelligence community and the military planners. The result has been the evolution of a nuclear-ignorant population and the rapid development of massive weapons of destruction on both sides. The result has also been peace, so far.

But it is a peace imperiled by everything from a malfunctioning microchip in a computer, which we have had, to a malfunctioning world leader, which we have also had. Richard W. Lyman, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, recently told a symposium on nuclear war: "We are faced with an unprecedented, all-but-indescribable power of destructiveness in the hands of a species with an all-too-familiar capacity for aggressive, not to mention self-destructive, behavior."

"Treating nuclear war, and even the nuclear arms race, as 'insanity' too readily becomes a way of oversimplifying the problems," he said. "It suggests that all that is necessary to be rid of this nightmare is to put power into the hands of people more rational than those who have been wielding it."

Lyman went on to suggest that the academic world should work to reduce the politicization of arms control and to educate students about arms control issues. The rest of the population must educate itself, as well.

That is already beginning to happen. A nuclear freeze movement is sweeping the country and has overtaken Congress.

Next week, Ground Zero, a bipartisan movement, will hold nuclear education week in 650 cities across the country. In Washington, Ground Zero week kicks off today with a descriptive tour of the aftermath of a 1 megaton bomb hitting Lafayette Park. Roger Molander, former nuclear strategist for the National Security Council under Presidents Nixon, Ford and Carter, and now executive director of Ground Zero, tells what would happen:

There would be a crater 1,000 feet in diameter and 200 feet deep, and out to a distance of 6/10 of a mile nothing would be recognizable. Within a radius of two miles everything would be flattened. At a distance of five miles out, all concrete and frame buildings would be destroyed. Within a radius of three miles almost everyone would be killed. At 10 miles, most people would survive the blast but face extreme dangers from fire.

But in the event of war, he says, strategists expect Washington and its surrounding towns to be hit by a number of bombs. Fort Belvoir, Andrews Air Force Base, the National Security Agency at Fort Meade, the communications equipment in Annapolis and possibly the CIA headquarters in McLean, would be hit by separate bombs, he says. "We don't have the Soviet war plans . . . We assume they would do it the way we would do theirs."

Ground Zero has put out a paperback book, "Nuclear War, What's In It For You," a primer on nuclear weapons, nuclear war and nuclear issues. This is a book that ought to be read by every citizen of every country that has nuclear weapons. It doesn't give any answers, but it lays out the issues so that we, the people, can help decide our fate. It describes the Soviet arsenals and it shows how we could get into nuclear war. It tells how in 35 years we came from having one bomb with the explosive power of 15 kilotons of TNT to having a world arsenal whose destructive power represents "10 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on the face of the earth."

Ground Zero can educate us. The next step is to sustain the momentum. We have to institutionalize our concern and our understanding of nuclear issues the way we institutionalize our knowledge of English and math. Nuclear issues are certainly more fundamental to survival of the species. From that, we may begin to find ways toward a less perilous peace, the way the English and the French did after centuries of war.

Throughout history, men have sent boys out to battle. But in the kind of war that is now becoming thinkable, men would be sending out entire populations of cities and nations of people. In nuclear jargon, Ground Zero is the point where a nuclear weapon is detonated. In survival jargon, it marks a beginning. We should, we must, make it the first step on the way back from the edge. ●

HEAD START PARENTS APPEAL FOR PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to get letters from Head Start parents who both testify to the ways in which this program has dramatically improved their lives and those of their children, and express their concerns about Head Start's future. We know that Head Start works; that Head Start is cost-effective. And yet, even today, it serves only 25 percent of the eligible children, and faces substantial erosion from inflation and cutbacks in supportive services—CETA, title XX, child care food, Medicaid. We need to listen to the parents of Head Start children and keep this exemplary program working. Another letter from a Head Start parent follows:

My child has a speech problem and the individual attention he gets in Head Start has helped him greatly. He learns a lot from being with other children. Head Start gives my children time away from me to learn to get along with other children. The health and dental check-ups have helped also. If it were not for Head Start I could not work because I could not afford to pay a private sitter. I work until 4:15, so a half day program would affect me greatly. I would have to pick up the children at noon and take them to a baby sitter for the rest of the day.

HEAD START PARENT,

Russellville, Ark. ●

TRIBUTE TO THE OHIO INSURANCE INSTITUTE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to congratulate the Ohio Insurance Institute on 50 years of outstanding service. Through

responsible advertising, research, and education, the institute has provided valuable insurance information to government and industry representatives as well as to the general public.

Ohio is recognized as one of the best insurance States in the Nation. For 50 years, one of the primary objectives of the institute and its predecessor organizations has been to put the public's interest first.

The Ohio Insurance Institute was born in 1932 and was called the Underwriters Service Association. Four insurance executives, elected as the first board of trustees of the association, recognized the need and potential of a cooperative insurance trade association in Ohio. These men were: B. D. Lecklider of Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.; Robert Pein of State Automobile Mutual Insurance Co.; William Safford of Western & Southern Indemnity Co.; and Murray Lincoln of Farm Bureau Mutual Auto Insurance Co., now Nationwide.

Here is a brief look at some of the accomplishments of the association in those early years. In 1936, the association helped promote the American Legion Safety Campaign—two insurance companies gave the use of their radio stations for that purpose. Later that year, a group of association executives met with Members of Congress in an effort to lessen the burden of the 1936 ICC regulations on small but financially sound companies. The association also developed the safe driver reward plan, the forerunner of today's safe driver plan. To inform the public about Ohio's new financial responsibility law, the association created a comprehensive educational program. Coverage was provided for those drivers who would not be eligible in the voluntary market. The association actively fought discrimination in coverage based on a person's race, and, after World War II, it provided voluntary automobile coverage for disabled veterans.

During the next two decades, the Ohio insurance industry continued to make strides in giving Ohio policyholders the best coverage possible. Then, in 1968, spurred on by the active expansion efforts of Ohio's Gov. James Rhodes, the Ohio Insurance Institute was begun, merging with its predecessors.

To promote the welfare of the public and the welfare of the insurance industry, the Ohio Insurance Institute has three divisions. The first division, Public Information, has a twofold objective: First, to restore and maintain public confidence in the insurance industry; and second, to preserve Ohio's relatively favorable climate for insurance operations. One way of fulfilling this objective is through a vigorous relationship with news media. A representative of the institute regularly

visits newspaper offices, radio, and TV stations. In 1981, 145 visits were made. These visits frequently result in radio and TV tapings and special news articles. In addition, a special edition of an "Ohio Insurance Guide" is given to each radio and TV station and newspaper in Ohio every year. Judicious use of news releases promotes good reader acceptance. These and other techniques have established excellent credibility with the news media.

The public information division also has an effective advertising program. It has clarified for the public those insurance issues that may have been unclear or misunderstood. Members of the Ohio Insurance Institute are willing to invest their time and money in the dissemination of the right information. And their efforts have paid off. There has been a marked improvement in the treatment of the insurance industry by the communications media. Laws have been passed—the 0.10 alcohol content drunk driving law, a new habitual offender law, antitheft and antiarson laws have been passed. And the industry receives frequent requests from government officials, legislators, and educational institutions for more insurance information.

The second division of the Ohio Insurance Institute is research and education. The annual publication, Ohio Insurance Guide, distributed widely throughout the State, is a major research project. The Guide collects extensive Ohio insurance data on principles of insurance, automobile insurance, property insurance, and society and insurance. Some recent studies included in the Guide were: "The Economic Impact of Insurance on Society"; "Voluntary Auto Insurance Market"; and "The Cost of Auto Insurance."

The division of research and education also undertakes the education of high school pupils and teaches about insurance matters. One of the education programs is a 3-day annual seminar for high school teachers of business education, economics, vocational education, mathematics, and driver education. The faculty for these seminars is drawn from college teachers of insurance and representatives of the insurance industry. Testimony from the participants of these seminars attest to the value of these programs.

The third division of the Ohio Insurance Institute is government and industry relations. This division provides insurance information to Ohio governmental organizations, members of the Ohio General Assembly, and Ohio legislators in Washington. It works closely with the Insurance Federation of Ohio, the organization of Ohio companies that has a primary responsibility in the lobbying and legislative areas. This division is helping solve the problems of redlining in Ohio—statewide action committees were established for

Cleveland, Dayton, and Youngstown. Standby committees are available for other Ohio cities if allegations of redlining develop. In addition, the institute honors those law enforcement troopers who are active in auto theft prevention. It cooperates with the Ohio department of Disaster Services in a tornado safety campaign. The institute has been invited to be the coordinating agency to disseminate insurance information, and to assist members of the public who suffer losses in the event of a national disaster or emergency.

As you can see, the Ohio Insurance Institute and its predecessor organizations have succeeded in fulfilling their primary purpose by promoting the welfare of Ohio citizens. Harry V. Jump, director of the Ohio Insurance Department, expressed his appreciation for the Ohio Insurance Institute when he said:

On several occasions, I have expressed the gratitude of the Ohio Insurance Department to the O.I.I. . . . for providing insurance buyers with proper information to allow them to purchase insurance intelligently. . . . The O.I.I. enables the industry to anticipate areas of public concern and assists in finding ways to alleviate that concern. The [Ohio Insurance] Department has always found O.I.I. responsive to its needs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Ohio Insurance Institute's past 50 years of service. However, I think this is an appropriate time to look forward as well. I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in wishing the members of the Ohio Insurance Institute the best of luck in continuing their outstanding service for the next 50 years.●

THE REAL ISSUE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the real disappointments in the national debate over our economic difficulties is that most important issue keeps getting sidetracked by political theatrics and one upmanship.

The issue is one of social responsibility and how we as a nation fulfill the truly American responsibility of caring for those in our society we consider less fortunate.

The debate over social welfare is not a question of the haves versus the have nots. It is not a matter of one party being more sensitive or compassionate than the other. It is not just a question of spending Federal money to provide for the needs of our citizens.

If we can get away from the emotionalism and political scare tactics for a brief period, we need to answer a number of important questions.

First. Has our system of providing social welfare through massive Federal programs failed?

Second. Has the cost of those programs or the burdens those costs place on taxpayers grown so large that the programs or the concept must be changed?

Third. Can private citizens, private organizations alone or in partnership with government meet all or at least more of our social responsibilities?

Fourth. Should government involvement be shifted from the Federal level to the State and local levels?

Fifth. Are the needy in our society best served by structured programs or are they better served by healthy economic conditions which benefit us all?

Jerry Klein, in a reflective commentary published in Peoria's Journal Star, April 5, addresses some of those questions and reminds us that the real budget issue before us is not so much one of numbers, but one of social responsibilities, social values, and fairness.

I hope you will take time to read, "Making Poverty Worse With Money," which I submit for insertion at this point in the RECORD:

MAKING POVERTY WORSE WITH MONEY

(By Jerry Klein)

We have continued to operate for the past several years under the benign assumption that poverty can be eliminated if only we are willing to spend enough money on the poor. The results have been disappointing, even disastrous. Not only are the poor still with us—more than ever, in fact—but we have erected a massive and costly welfare state which threatens the existence of the middle class and which reduces an increasingly large slice of society to helpless dependency.

Feeding the poor is one of the corporal works of mercy, and it remains an almost statutory obligation. When an entire government takes on the task, it might seem to be one of those happy acts of national morality, like the Marshall Plan after World War II, when the concerns of the state seem to coincide with those of a much higher authority. But what we have instead is a costly and inefficient bureaucracy which has grown dedicated to perpetuating not only itself but the dependent status of the poor. If the poor cease to exist, so does the welfare bureaucracy.

The overall picture is almost too staggering to comprehend. We now have a president who, in attempting to prune some of this back to more tolerable limits, has brought forth howls of outrage from the righteous. Some of these perhaps foresee that the injunction to feed the hungry might fall more upon the individuals and less upon the government. It is far easier to be charitable when the money is simply extracted from paychecks in the form of taxes.

Real charity is something else. And we are finding a middle class, or what is left of it, increasingly disillusioned. Many of its members have discovered that those they are being taxed to support are living better than the taxpayers are . . . and with far less to worry about.

I know a wage-earner, for instance, who drinks Buckhorn Beer, drives a 10-year-old car and looks at a black and white television set. He tends to grow somewhat resentful when standing in line at the supermarket with his generic or bargain purchases and observes people with food stamps lining up, their carts bulging with steaks, pizza, frozen food and expensive junk food. He worries over his next electric bill and the next house payment. Because he is sober (who can be anything else on Buckhorn Beer?), reliable and has a job, there will be no help for him from Washington, or elsewhere.

It seems to many that in playing the role of Robin Hood, the federal government has mistaken those barely above the poverty level as the rich, has assaulted these and given their possessions to those marginally poorer. We have evolved therefore into a kind of two-class society—those who have and those who used to have.

If one could detail some worthwhile result from this vast social upheaval, it might be easily defended. Clearly, the eradication of poverty is a utopian dream that will never happen. But there has not even been a reduction in the poverty level.

There are more poor and hungry people than ever, which seems a logical outcome from a system which encourages a passive, unproductive way of life among those for whom welfare has become a continuing, perpetuating existence.

Instead of teaching the poor how to make bread, how to lead productive lives, we have simply sent out the checks and said, in effect, "let them eat cake." And we have turned the middle class into the bakers.

Anyone who dares criticize the government's welfare excesses is almost certain to be branded as wicked and selfish, a scrooge who would take food from the mouths of babes.

But it is not that simple. We have almost succeeded in making a mockery out of industry, hard work and personal pride by penalizing those who produce and rewarding those who do not. Even Robin Hood knew better than this. ●

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT MEL LAIRD

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to represent Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District in the House of Representatives since the resignation of former Representative Melvin R. Laird to become Secretary of Defense in 1969. Although we come from opposite political parties and have been on opposing sides on some issues, we are good friends.

Carleton College each year designates a graduate for its Alumni Achievement Award and recently it honored Mel Laird. The remarks John M. Lavine, publisher of the Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram newspaper, made on this occasion, I found most interesting. I thought Mel's former colleagues might also find them of interest. Publisher Lavine, a Carleton graduate in presenting the award, said:

Ladies and gentlemen: First as a Carleton student—and for the past 18 years as a working journalist—I have learned at least two significant lessons.

One is that people often have a view of history that fits what they wish to believe, rather than what really happened.

The second is that a large part of America and Carleton's strength rests on the degree to which each fosters the right of people to hold different points of view.

These two lessons are appropriate touchstones for the Alumni Achievement Award that I have the honor of presenting tonight to Melvin R. Laird.

Since he graduated from Carleton in 1944, Melvin Laird has forged a career that defines the word achievement.

He was elected to the Wisconsin State Senate at the age of 23. Many important pieces of legislation in our state bear his name—as should federal revenue sharing, which he promoted in Wisconsin and later brought into being in Washington.

When Mel Laird went to the House of Representatives—where he was elected to 9 terms—the record will show that his keen intellect and the combination of his fiscal conservatism and yet, his strong support of health care and medical research legislation helped propel him to the number two spot—just behind Gerald Ford—among House Republicans.

Perhaps that is why the American Political Science Association gave him its coveted Distinguished Service Award and cited Laird as—(and I quote)—“a forthright and persistent advocate whose intellectual courage and ability have consistently enlightened and enlivened public discussion of the important issues facing the nation”—(unquote.)

Of course, the issue with which many people most associate our awardee is Vietnam.

Again, I wish now—and particularly I wished back in the late 60's and early 70's—that critics at Carleton and elsewhere would remember those two basic lessons—the importance of fostering differing points of view and the importance of recalling what really occurred in history; not what people would like to believe took place.

Take it from one who edited a daily newspaper which editorially opposed Vietnam in late 1965—long before such a position was popular or even tolerable to most of you—Mel Laird's record on Vietnam is a long way from the one I often hear so glibly discussed.

Congressman Laird warned both the president who initiated America's involvement in Vietnam—John Kennedy—and the president who built that conflict to its zenith—Lyndon Johnson—that a land war in Southeast Asia was wrong. He also told them that it was a mistake to change the role of American military personnel from advisors to ground combatants.

During the time that he was Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird also made it his goal to reduce American ground commitment in Vietnam each month that he served. That was a difficult task, because it was opposed by some other members of the Administration and the Congress. It was also difficult because each month during the previous six years, American ground commitments in Vietnam had increased.

Nonetheless, Secretary Laird achieved that goal, even though it went unheralded. It was obliterated by this country's domestic thrashings which, ironically, were supposed to be requesting an end to the violence of war.

In the shaping and carrying out of public policy, Melvin Laird's record throughout his career has also been one of candor in public life. One of the traits which makes him so formidable is that his agenda is always up-front. He walks as he talks.

Indeed, if some leaders in both political parties—especially some who led this country in the last two decades—had adopted that trait, they and the nation would have been far better off.

For my part, I know this facet of Mel because there have been many times when he and the editorials of our newspapers have disagreed.

I would tell you in confidence that at first I wondered if this disagreement disqualified him for this award. Then, upon reflection, I realized that even he can't always be right.

In fact, of course, I would argue that if Carleton College stands for anything, it would stand for giving Mel Laird and me the tools to pursue the different goals which each of us believe is the wisest public policy.

There is one other item I will briefly mention in the otherwise far too long to recount litany of our awardee's accomplishments. I mention it only because of its special meaning for today's Carleton students who, I am told, have more than a vague concern about reinstatement of the draft. As you raise these concerns, you should know that Melvin Laird began the all-volunteer army.

Finally, and on a personal note, let me say that I think Mel Laird deserves this award not only because he had the wisdom to grow up and serve the finest part of the United States, northern Wisconsin; not only because he is a member, with me, or that exclusive club of people with permanent hair cuts, but also because when he left public life and became Senior Counselor for the Reader's Digest, he joined those of us who are in that special group of mischief makers called journalists.

On behalf of the Carleton Alumni Association, it gives me great personal pleasure to present this award for Distinguished Achievement to Melvin R. Laird. ●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay homage to the 6 million men, women, and children that fell victim to Nazi extermination plans during World War II. As a crime unique in the annals of history, different not only in the quantity of violence but in its manner and purpose as a mass criminal enterprise organized and carried out by the state against defenseless civilian populations, I believe that we have a solemn obligation to the circumstances that prevented the world from recognizing the moral truths which permitted the Holocaust to proceed.

I believe the American philosopher George Santayana stated it rather well when he warned that those who forget history are condemned to

repeat it. Remembering can instill caution, fortify restraint, protect against future evil or indifference, and can only be prolonged by an understanding of what happened and how it occurred. We must never forget the dreadful consequences which sometime accompany the exercise of absolute power.

Along these lines, I would like to reiterate my strong support for this annual commemoration of the Holocaust during these Days of Remembrance. Clearly, if we are to learn from the past, we must be aware of what has occurred. Given the depths of human cruelty which are revealed by the Holocaust, I can understand how the temptation might exist to sweep such unpleasant memories from our collective consciousness. However, to proceed in such a manner would not only perform a great injustice to ourselves and future generations but also to the 6 million who perished during an event which many of us still regard as inconceivable.●

WE MUST ALL REMEMBER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks Yom Hashoah or Day of Holocaust which commemorates the brutal genocide of over 6 million Jews during World War II at the hands of the Nazis. It is a day when all Americans, indeed all the people of the world should pause and reflect on the cruel torture and death that a supposedly civilized world allowed to be inflicted upon fellow human beings for no other reason than they practice a specific religion.

The horrors of the concentration camps which included starvation, beatings, forced labor, family separation, and every imaginable humiliation and indignity can be described but never understood by those who did not experience the nightmare.

We all have an obligation to remember so that we will stand up and speak out whenever such an atrocity appears imminent. But we have failed to live up to our responsibilities to the millions of people who have perished in recent years in the genocide in Biafra, Ethiopia, and Cambodia. It is incumbent upon all people to condemn terror, brutality and extermination wherever it occurs. The building of such memorials as Yad Veshem in Israel with its eternal flames to commemorate the 6 million who perished in the Holocaust is important, but an even greater tribute to those who have perished would be the end of genocide.

As a member of a minority, I for one, will never forget, for I know what

it is like to experience the hate and indignities of my fellow human beings. The outrage and humiliation, I have felt can help me to empathize with the suffering of those who experienced the Holocaust and strengthens my resolve to continue my dedication to the cause of human rights.●

MSHA CUTS OPPOSED

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, a number of miners in my district, as well as others, have written to me expressing their concerns about the proposed administration cuts in funding for the Mine Safety and Health Administration. Claude West, finance secretary for Local No. 1548, United Mine Workers of America, Beaver Dam, Ky., has written me a thoughtful letter on this subject. I believe that my constituent's letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: I am again writing to you about a matter of grave importance to all the members of this local union as well as myself. The matter that I am speaking of is the proposed cut in the funding of the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA).

We, the members of Local Union No. 1548, United Mine Workers of America (UMWA), are totally opposed to these cuts in funding and personnel. We believe that this is one program that, if cut, would jeopardize the health and safety of all miners, whether union or non-union. We also believe that this move would result in the loss of many lives in the mines in this nation.

We believe that the events of recent weeks should be proof that, instead of less, more should be done in the way of enforcement and inspections. We ask that you would take into consideration the widows and fatherless children left behind because the law was not enforced or inspections were not made. Again, we want to make it clear to the lawmakers of this country that these things do make a difference in the work place. We also want to make it clear that the United Mine Workers of America feel that lives and limbs are more important than budgets.

We know that this Administration has promised to cut government spending. We feel that the President ought to take into consideration the events that brought about the formation of an agency such as MSHA and what the effects would be on the people that MSHA protects if the program is made useless. The President has said that he has heard the voice of the people. Who are the people calling for cuts in MSHA? Certainly not the men and women who go into the mines in this country.

Again, Local Union No. 1548, UMWA, its officers, and members, ask that you sound our views so that all might know that this group of citizens is opposed to these cuts.

Thank you again for your time and help with this important issue.

Yours truly,

CLAUDE WEST,
Finance Secretary,
Local Union No. 1548.●

FINDING THE SILVER LINING

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we do not expect the news of the day to be cheerful and heartening. And it usually is not. The news is full of crime, conflict, poverty, and strife. Some people shrug their shoulders at bad news. However, most feel a responsibility to right wrongs and the endless struggle to improve our world can be frustrating.

Every once in a while, we find someone who has taken a step back from all the bad news to see what we, as Americans, really have going for us. This past Saturday on the editorial page of the Times Record of Troy, N.Y., someone took that step. I commend to my colleagues this editorial entitled "Finding the Silver Lining."

The message is simple, but often overlooked. We do not always need fanfare to celebrate our great Nation. Sometimes a reminder of our tremendous opportunity and good fortune is all the encouragement that is needed.

I warmly appreciate the thoughtfulness and patriotism which inspired this editorial. It has fortified me and all who have read it.

The article follows:

FINDING THE SILVER LINING

Congratulations.

You have made it to the opinion page. You have survived the wars, the rumors of wars, the crashes, the collapsing economy, the corruption, the broken families, the beaten children, the murders, the misery and all the other news of fresh disasters you read about on our previous pages.

You may have concluded that these are terrible times and that almost everything about life on Earth has gone awoul.

But before you begin looking for a new planet to live on, please consider:

The United States is at peace. If we should ever go to war again, the "terrible times" we live in now will be known as "the good old days."

Most people die of natural causes, and the average American of today lives almost 27 years longer than his counterpart in 1900.

Most husbands love their wives. Most wives love their husbands. Most parents love their children. Most children love their parents. Most children do not become professional criminals. Most children grow up to be a credit to the parents who raised them. Most parents are glad they had them.

We are living in the midst of the greatest economic miracle in the history of the world. Caesar, Charlemagne and Louis XIV never lived as well materially as the average American does today. Two billion people in

the world today are living in poverty, but that still leaves two billion who are not and that is something very new and amazing. Just the idea that the average person could live in comfort is a child of our times.

Most politicians are not on the take. Most business people do not try to cheat you. Most doctors, lawyers, police officers, welders, bricklayers, tax-preparers, etc. work hard and earn their keep.

This is not to say the world doesn't need a lot of fixing up. But sometimes people become so overwhelmed by the despair they see in their newspaper and on the six o'clock news that they forget how far we've come and how far we could go if we don't resign ourselves to evil.

Remember, the newspaper prints all this awful news because it is out of the ordinary. A lot of the good things don't get printed because they are so common.

Thank God.●

STEAKHOUSE REVIEW—TOKYO STYLE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that because of her very tight beef quotas, the price of beef in Japan is sky high—but we sometimes forget how high sky high can be.

The Japan Economic Foundation has started a new monthly publication entitled "Journal of Japanese Trade and Industry." It is an interesting publication which describes the latest in industrial and technical developments in Japan. But the March 17, 1982 issue also reviews several steakhouses in downtown Tokyo.

The restaurant reviews a half-pound steak which, with a salad and two beers, sold for about \$210 3 years ago. Fortunately, that took the reviewer's breath away—or as he says, "we were dumbfounded." Therefore, the review moves on to more reasonably priced items: A steak of a little over 1 pound (along with salad, ice cream, fruit, tax and service charge) at another restaurant sells for ¥9,600 or \$40 at today's exchange rate (\$48 at a more normal exchange rate). This is described as a "reasonable price." Finally, the article reviews a real bargain—a 200-gram steak (about 40 percent of a pound) which sells to the luncheon crowd for ¥1,000 or \$4 to \$5.

Mr. Speaker, clearly what Tokyo needs is a chain of Ponderosa's or Bonanza's. I bring all this up, because the Japanese want to sell us—and many Americans want to buy—beautifully crafted and engineered electronics, automobiles, and machine tools. Yet when we have something in which the United States clearly has a comparative advantage—in price and quality—we are blocked from selling in Japan through quotas which drive prices so high that the demand for our products is destroyed.

Japan's exports to the United States will continue to run into a buzzsaw of criticism until they open their markets to more of our products.

The full text of the restaurant review is printed below:

SUEHIRO—GOOD STEAK AT REASONABLE PRICES

Tokyo is a steak lover's paradise. Good steak restaurants abound, ranging from the popularly priced Chaco and Misono of Kobe origin to the exclusive Aragawa.

Three years ago, I went with a friend to Aragawa, recommended as the best steakhouse in Tokyo in a steakhouse guide. It was a small, unpretentious looking place located near Shimbashi Station, within walking distance of the Imperial Hotel.

Aragawa's 250-gram steak, broiled slowly over a fire of special charcoal, was certainly delicious and equal to our high expectation. But when the time came to pay the bill, we were dumbfounded: ¥42,000! This included tax and a service charge, but all we had was the steak, salad and two bottles of beer. The restaurant did not have a menu, so we had no advance warning how much this was going to be.

Of the dozens of good steak experiences available in Tokyo, I would recommend the 500-gram offering at Suehiro, behind the Matsuzakaya department store in Ginza.

For taste, price, and service, Suehiro gives you the most for your money.

The beef comes directly from Suehiro's own ranch. It is flavored with salt and pepper and marinated in a special preparation of soybean sauce, salad oil, sake, seasoning, and vegetable essence such as onion and celery. It is then broiled slowly over a charcoal fire, a special method which Suehiro has been using for more than 50 years to bring out the inner taste of the beef. It is marvellously delicious. And the cost per person is 9,600 yen including salad, coffee, ice cream, fruit, tax and service charge. For a 400-gram steak, the bill is 7,800 yen.

Suehiro is a five-story restaurant. The first and second floors serve the smaller 200-gram steaks. Moderately priced at 1,000 yen, these steaks are very popular with office workers and businessmen. The fifth floor is the place for relaxed dining in a refined atmosphere.

It should be worth adding that Suehiro hasn't raised its prices for five years, and yet has maintained its very high standards.●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST—TENNESSEE'S WINNING SPEECH

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate a young constituent of mine, Christi Richardson of Cleveland, Tenn., for her winning speech on the theme "Building America Together." Christi's speech was selected as the best from Tennessee in the Veterans of Foreign War's Voice of Democracy contest. I believe that her speech, as follows, carries a message to which we all should listen:

America.

It is many things.

It is a mood—a state of mind—a philosophy.

America is acres of waving grain or snow-capped mountains, sandy beaches and waving palms—a land of majestic beauty.

But it is also people.

It is a farmer in Iowa plowing his soil, a steelworker in Birmingham, a New England fisherman tending his nets.

It is the Statue of Liberty welcoming all.

And one thing America has always been is people working together.

It was people working together who built the first home, the first church, the first school.

Working together, people rebuilt a united America that had been torn in two by inward strife. Many thought the Civil War had completely destroyed a great nation that had been built on freedom.

But instead, it made each man look at one another in equality. And the black and the white man began to build together again.

The Great Depression brought a time of testing. Overnight, fortunes were lost, and many lost everything they had. Many people had nothing left—but the ability and the desire to build again.

It was a time when the men were again forced to work side by side. The struggle was long and hard but many will remember it as a time when the people of this nation learned the value of life.

And let us never forget that it was by working together we survived two world wars.

But these things have all been in the past and I personally don't remember these things.

When I think of people building together, what can I relate to? What can I remember?

I do remember seeing the first man walk on the moon. I remember when he took that first step and spoke for all those who made this most difficult task possible when he said, "One small step for man, one giant step for mankind."

And I do remember that tragic day on November 4, 1979, when we heard the news that the Americans had been taken hostage.

Even though I didn't know these people, I felt as if they were part of my family. We saw their parents, interviewed their wives, went into their homes, and we all felt like part of their family.

It was a rallying point which began to bring back a new surge of patriotism.

Now, we all had one common goal to work for—the release of the hostages. After over a year I remember the national celebration in which we all participated when they were released.

Together we had suffered. Together we rejoiced.

Not all of our problems have been solved. Not all of the work is done, and not all of the goals have been accomplished.

For us there is much to do.

As a nation, we, the young people, will be faced with new problems which will demand solutions.

New problems?

Sure!

But the same old way of solving them—working together!●

IT'S TIME TO CHANGE
DIRECTION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the second year of his administration, President Reagan is offering to the American people a collection of economic policies and Federal budget proposals that add up to more bad news in the rest of 1982 and 1983 in terms of lost jobs, lost income, and a loss of the sense of fairness and social justice which holds our Nation together.

Since last July, the number of unemployed has increased by 1.8 million; 30 percent of industrial capacity is idle and factory output is down 8.6 percent. Despite this, the administration tells America to wait. I urge you to read the following letter from a constituent of mine who believed in the Reagan rhetoric and voted for the President in 1980. He has changed his position drastically and has requested that I share his letter with every Member of Congress. Many of my constituents have come to me with the same feelings and now realize that the United States must have a complete about-face to begin to revitalize our Nation:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The following remarks are made with genuine reluctance, but I'm desperate and I hope that you will do me the service of letting people know how I feel.

Congressman FORD, after graduating from Taylor Center High in 1966, I worked for a time at minimum wage at a store, as I couldn't get a better job—for I was 1A. I didn't complain and went to Viet Nam in 1968 and proudly served in the Americal Division. In August of 1969 I was severely wounded in action at LZ Baldy, about 16 miles southwest of Danang. I didn't complain; I believed in America and Americanism. In 1972 I joined the Democratic Party, worked for you and Senator McGovern (for President) and by 1974 I had graduated from the U-M at Dearborn and began working at McLouth Steel Corp. Being shocked at the National deficit and seeing all of the problems brought about by big government, I worked for President Ford in 1976 and President Ronald Reagan in 1980.

In 1976 I had the good fortune of being elected to the Taylor Board of Education. Again, I believed in the American system.

Now, here is my situation:

1. McLouth Steel, thanks to high interest rates and the lack of leadership by President Reagan in stopping the dumping of Japanese and Belgianese steel, is just about ready to fold.

2. My property taxes have gone up so dramatically that my house payments have gone from \$343 to \$505 a month. (How is the New Federalism going to help Taylor?)

3. I get 40 percent VA disability. Now I hear that my pension will be terminated or cut.

4. My mother, a widow, is on social security. She is in poor health and worried about

her future. Obviously, I won't be able to help her.

5. The area around here is in a depression. It's obvious I'll have problems getting a job. The President was wrong when he said that all we have to do is look in the newspaper want ads.

6. I'm not lazy. I've missed three days of work the last two years. I bid on and received a "move up" on a job requiring more technical training. I worked hard and worked all of the overtime I could.

7. In 1975 I qualified for the Air Traffic Controller position opening which I noticed. I scored an 82, and being a 10-point vet, I thought I would be hired. I thought wrong—I wasn't hired, with no explanation.

8. I don't have any job prospects, but I've applied everywhere I could.

Now, I have bills well over a thousand a month (counting utilities and food). Yet, I'm called a high consumer by the Republicans I know. This isn't true, as I paid off both of my cars (now 7 and 11 years old), 2 time payments and a credit card.

But I can't afford Reaganomics. I believed in Mr. Reagan. I felt he would pass a fair tax bill through Congress. Now, my rich relatives are better off than ever, while I'm near bankruptcy.

What do I tell my family when I tell them that I can't find a job? What do I need to give up next to help the elite of this, a country I thought I loved?

I don't know what I'll do—pride keeps me from expecting handouts—but I'll be waiting to see if Reagan changes his attitudes toward the working men and women of America. In the Fall I wrote the President. I complained that his policies weren't working. I got a form letter saying that the President appreciated my support for him and his administration.

It's this attitude that is ruining him, his administration, and—most importantly—our country.

Please, let the administration know how this Reagan supporter of 1980 feels. God knows, I've gotten nowhere with them.

Sincerely,

DAVID T. ALEXANDER.●

THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, just before the Easter recess, I introduced H.R. 6099 which creates a National Industrial Development Board comprised of business executives, union presidents, political leaders, and representatives of the public interest. A detailed statement outlining the structure and purpose of this legislation appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1982 on pages 6620-23. Significant interest has been expressed in this bill since its introduction. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD:

H.R. 6099

A bill to establish a National Industrial Development Board for purposes of formulating policy recommendations for industrial development in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Industrial Development Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the vitality of industry in the United States has declined precipitously in recent years;

(2) such decline constitutes a severe threat to the economic future of the United States;

(3) many factors have contributed to such decline, including lagging productivity and product quality, increasing imports, reduced competitiveness of goods in foreign markets, high energy prices, shortsighted management strategies, inadequate supply of skilled workers, hostility between management and labor, insufficient employee participation in the workplace, and inadequate Federal commitments in such crucial areas as transportation, and other infrastructure, and research;

(4) the numerous causes of economic decline in the United States can be redressed only by a comprehensive national industrial strategy;

(5) such a strategy should also encourage the development of emerging high-technology industries that can provide substantial economic growth and employment;

(6) such a strategy will succeed only if (A) it has the common support of the principal sectors of the economy, including business, labor, Government, and the public; and (B) each such sector is willing to make sacrifices to ensure mutual recovery; and

(7) the antipathy that often prevails among such sectors hampers development of a consensus necessary for economic recovery in the United States.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to establish a Federal board designed to produce a national industrial strategy that will have the support of each principal party to the industrial problems of the United States;

(2) to establish a mechanism for the development, outside of the normal political process, of consensual solutions to specific industrial problems confronting the Congress or any Federal department or agency;

(3) to establish a mechanism for the anticipation of future industrial problems and the timely identification of shifts in international markets and competitive standings;

(4) to supplement the adversarial mode of problem solving that has prevailed in industry in the United States during the past century with a new approach based upon consensus among business, labor, Government, and appropriate public groups; and

(5) to revive the industrial base of the United States through an approach premised on the proposition that most sectors of the economy are necessary and can survive if they adapt sensibly to the new markets, technologies, organizational designs, and relationships between labor and management that are presently emerging.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD

SEC. 3. There hereby is established a board to be known as the National Industrial De-

velopment Board (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Board").

DUTIES OF BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The duties of the Board are—

(1) to prepare and publish reports setting forth the recommendations of the Board with respect to national industrial development priorities, including (A) macroeconomic policy; and (B) the needs of basic industrial sectors (such as the automobile, steel, and semiconductor industries) and supportive sectors (such as the financial and communications industries), without regard to whether any such sector is undergoing or anticipating difficulties; and

(2) to provide policy recommendations and reports to the Congress and to Federal departments and agencies with respect to specific issues of national industrial policy, in response to requests from the Congress or any such department or agency under subsection (c)(1).

(b) The Board may encourage, with respect to individual industrial sectors, the development of committees, consisting of representatives of business, labor, Government, and the public, to examine the particular problems of such industrial sectors.

(c)(1) The Board shall issue recommendations and reports under subsection (a)(2) only upon request of—

(A) the head of a Federal department or agency, with respect to a matter pending before such department or agency; or

(B) a majority vote by a committee or subcommittee of the Congress, with respect to a matter pending before such committee or subcommittee.

(2) The Board shall issue any report requested under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable within the six-month period following the date such report is requested. The Board shall, to the extent practicable, comply with any request for expedited preparation of a report.

(3) Upon receipt by any committee or subcommittee of the Congress of any report requested by such committee or subcommittee under paragraph (1)(B), the Board shall consult with such committee or subcommittee with respect to such report, and, following such consultation, such committee or subcommittee shall submit to its House a report setting forth its views and recommendations with respect to the report of the Board.

(4) The Board may, upon the vote of a majority of its members, decline to respond to any request for a report under paragraph (1) if such majority determines that such request relates to any matter that is not of immediate importance. The Board may not decline to respond to any such request if (A) such request relates to a Government loan or loan guarantee, or (B) the Board is notified by the President that such request relates to an emergency situation.

(d) In preparing reports and formulating recommendations under this Act, the members of the Board shall attempt to reach the maximum degree of consensus practicable on any matter of controversy.

(e) The Board shall establish procedures to ensure that no report issued by the Board under this Act shall be released to the public by any member or employee of the Board before the expiration of seven days following the date such report is issued, unless the Board, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, determines that earlier release of such report to the public is appropriate.

MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a)(1) The Board shall be composed of thirty-two members appointed by the

President from among individuals recommended for appointment to the Board by the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the minority leader of the House.

(2) Of the individuals appointed under paragraph (1)—

(A)(i) eleven shall be appointed from among the individuals recommended by the majority leader of the Senate;

(ii) five shall be appointed from among the individuals recommended by the minority leader of the Senate;

(iii) eleven shall be appointed from among the individuals recommended by the Speaker of the House; and

(iv) eleven shall be appointed from among the individuals recommended by the minority leader of the House; and

(B)(i) eight shall be, on the date of their appointment, Members of the Congress or heads of Federal departments or agencies;

(ii) eight shall be, on the date of their appointment, chief executive officers or chief operating officers of corporations determined by the President to be major corporations engaging in interstate commerce;

(iii) eight shall be, on the date of their appointment, heads of national or international labor unions; and

(iv) eight shall be, on the date of their appointment, individuals representative of sectors of society or the economy that are not otherwise represented on the Board and are determined by the President to be challenging the economic status quo, such as consumer, educational, environmental, and minority groups, and small businesses in emerging sectors having substantial potential for growth.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3), each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of six years. No individual may serve as a member of the Board for more than two terms.

(2) Of the members first appointed—

(A) two of the members described in each clause of subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be appointed for a term of two years; and

(B) three of the members described in each such clause shall be appointed for a term of four years;

as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(c) No member of the Board shall be required, by reason of membership on the Board, to file any financial disclosure report under title II of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. appendix).

(d) Members of the Board shall serve without pay, allowances, or benefits. Members shall be reimbursed for actual expenses, including travel expenses, incurred in the course of performing the duties vested in the Board.

(e) The Board shall establish a quorum requirement to ensure that a substantial number of members described in each clause of subsection (a)(2)(B) are required for any action by the Board, except that the Board may provide that a lesser number of its members may hold hearings.

(f) The President shall designate one member of the Board as its Chairman. The

term of office of the Chairman shall be one year. In making such designations, the President shall ensure that the office of Chairman shall be rotated consecutively among the four categories of members described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

(g)(1) The Board shall meet not less than six times in each calendar year, at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members. The Board shall seek to ensure that each member of the Board attends not less than one-half of the meetings of the Board held in each calendar year. Each member of the Board shall designate one alternate representative to attend any meeting that such member is unable to attend. In the course of attending any such meeting, an alternate representative shall be considered a member of the Board for all purposes, including voting.

(2) Each member of the Board shall be notified not less than three weeks in advance of any meeting of the Board, unless the Chairman and a majority of the members of the Board determine in any case that it is necessary for the Board to meet without such period of advance notice.

DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF BOARD; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Board shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, have a Director who shall be appointed upon a vote of three-fourths of the members of the Board, and who shall be paid at a rate of pay determined by the Board to be appropriate.

(b) Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Board, and without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code—

(1) each member of the Board may appoint and fix the pay of personnel to serve on the personal staff of such member; and

(2) the Board may appoint and fix the pay of additional personnel to serve the Board generally.

(c) The Director and staff of the Board may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(d) Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Board, the Board may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) Upon request of the Board, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Board to assist the Board in carrying out its duties under this Act.

POWERS OF BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) The Board may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Board considers appropriate. The Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) Any member or agent of the Board may, if so authorized by the Board, take any action that the Board is authorized to take in this section.

(c) The Board may secure directly from any Federal department or agency information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Board, the head of such department or

agency shall furnish such information to the Board.

(d) The Board may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations or services or property.

(e) The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Federal departments and agencies.

(f) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Board on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Board may request.

(g)(1) The Board may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Board. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(2) If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contempt, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may, upon application by the Board, order such person to appear before the Board to produce evidence or to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) The subpoenas of the Board shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(4) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(5) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. No individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture by reason of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

SEC. 8. The Board shall be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix).

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 9. (a) The Board shall annually prepare and transmit to the President and to each House of the Congress a brief report setting forth the major industrial development priorities of the United States and the policies needed to meet such priorities. Such report shall contain a statement of the findings and conclusions of the Board during the previous fiscal year, together with any recommendations of the Board for such legislation or administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

(b) Upon receipt by either House of the Congress, the report described in subsection

(a) shall be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of such House. The Board shall consult with each such committee with respect to such report, and, following such consultation, each such committee shall submit to its House a report setting forth the views and recommendations of such committee with respect to the report of the Board.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed \$8,000,000 for any fiscal year, to carry out the provisions of this Act for fiscal year 1983, and for each of the succeeding five fiscal years.●

THE HARLEY O. STAGGERS FEDERAL BUILDING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting for the RECORD a speech delivered by Attorney Sam Angotti, resident of Morgantown, W. Va., on the occasion of naming the Federal Building in Morgantown, W. Va., "The Harley O. Staggers Federal Building."

SPEECH BY ATTORNEY SAM ANGOTTI

On this occasion I would like to take the liberty of being the spokesperson for the many thousands of citizens who reside in the Second Congressional District of the State of West Virginia, who dearly love Harley O. Staggers, Sr. and his beautiful family.

Our state, and I might add very few states, have ever had a public servant who has served so long with so much admiration and trust as has existed between Congressman Staggers and his constituents. He was never looked upon as a politician but rather as a big brother, trusted friend and ally who was a link between the citizens of this District and our National Government. No deeper bond of love and trust ever existed between any congressman in the history of the United States than that bond that was created and persisted to the end between Harley O. Staggers, Sr. and the citizens that comprised the Second Congressional District of West Virginia.

Not only did this love exist between Congressman Staggers and his constituents, but also it existed and still exists between Congressman Staggers and those with whom he served in our National Government. In my 25 years in politics I have rubbed elbows with many congressmen, U.S. Senators, and yes, even Presidents of the United States, and I have never witnessed such affection and respect as that shown Harley O. Staggers, Sr. by his peers in our National Government. I personally know that many U.S. Senators and Congressmen, visited our district and voted for legislative measures sponsored by Mr. Staggers simply because if he was for it—it has to be worthy—and thus good for our Nation. Witness to the last statement was the visit of the then President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, to the City of Morgantown, several years ago, whose sole purpose of visiting with us was to help honor this distinguished American. In the Halls of Congress his very name connotes honesty, integrity, ability

and trust. The only criticism, if you want to call it that, I have ever heard concerning Congressman Staggers was that he was too good because he didn't fit the mold. I always treated that statement as a tribute to this great Congressman.

Why all of this love for this man on the part of private citizens and national leaders? The answer is simple. It is the result of all of the love that he exhibited when he was a Congressman for his fellow man through the many bills that he either sponsored or co-sponsored in the Halls of Congress. In my hands I hold a book that I call a book of love. This book contains many legislative bills that our Congressman either solely sponsored or co-sponsored that reflects the love that this man had for his district, State and Nation. In this book we see this love exhibited by the following legislation:

He showed that he cared for those who are suffering from cancer and those in the future who will be confronted with this problem by creating through legislation a supreme endeavor to discover a cure and prevention for this insidious killer; and also by establishing a National Cancer Authority to achieve that end.

He showed that he cared for those seeking an education in the field of nursing and also for those training as physicians, dentist, pharmacist, optometrists and professional public health personnel by increasing their opportunities.

He was instrumental in the modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities and the development of new technology systems and concepts in providing health services.

He cared about the air that we breathe by authorizing grants under the Clean Air Act.

He cared for the drivers and passengers in motor vehicles by creating a co-ordinated national safety program and safety standards to reduce traffic accidents and their resulting deaths, injuries and property damage.

He cared about our young children by amending the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to protect our young children from accidental death or injury by insuring safety in reference to drug containers, labeling and also banning hazardous toys and articles intended for children.

He cared for those suffering from mental retardation and mental health generally by amending the public health laws to extend, expand and improve our public health laws as they affect those so afflicted.

He also cared for those suffering from eye disease by helping to create the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health under the Public Health Act.

He was concerned for the protecting of public health from radiation emission from electronic products and thus amended the Public Health Service Act to provide for such protection.

He was concerned for alcoholics and narcotic addicts by amending the Community Mental Health Centers Act to provide for special facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts.

He was concerned for the drug problems that we have experienced in our society in the last several years by amending the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act that called for penalties of those indulging in the illegal manufacture and traffic of drugs.

He has cared for the migratory agricultural workers by creating regional medical locations for such workers under the Public Health Service Act.

He has been concerned about the type of water that we drink by amending the Public Health Service Act so as to help secure safe community water supplies and has also been concerned about solid waste disposal by extending research and assistance to all of the States in their planning for such disposal.

He has been concerned about those suffering from diseases of the digestive tract including the liver and pancreas and diseases of nutrition by amending the Public Health Service Act to aid States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases.

He was concerned of those who travel by air by amending the Federal Airport Act to provide additional Federal assistance for the construction, alteration and improvement of airports, airport terminals and to provide relief of congestion at public airports.

On many occasions he has been concerned for the protection of consumers by amending the Federal Trade Commission Act in various categories to insure that the right of the consumer were protected including protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices and providing for class actions for acts in the fraud of consumers.

He has been concerned about family planning services by amending the Public Health Service Act to provide for special project grants for the research, training and technical assistance in such services.

He has been concerned about the welfare of our citizens in implementing the Flammable Fabrics Act.

He has been concerned about the energy crisis in the United States by helping to establish a commission on fuels and energy to insure through maximum use of indigenous resources that the U.S. requirements for low cost energy be met and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs.

He has been concerned about the transmission of noise that has proved detrimental to the human environment by controlling the generation and transmission of noise.

He has been concerned with those who are without housing by authorizing the securities and exchange commission to permit companies subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1938 to provide housing of low and moderate income.

He has been concerned with those suffering from heart, lung and neurological diseases and strokes by amending the Public Health Service Act in order to more effectively carry out the national effort against those diseases.

He has been concerned with the freedom of air traffic by amending the Federal Aviation Act that authorizes the President of the United States to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking; and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to suspend operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances.

He has been concerned with the quality of the food that we consume by requiring the disclosure of the ingredients on the labels of all foods.

He has been further concerned in many other fields including the chronically ill, those who suffer from arthritis, metabolism diseases, the protection of the public health and safety in reference to milk and cheese, and costs of Health care generally, maternal and child health and crippled children services, medical injury compensation insurance, all forms of communicable diseases, shortages of natural gas by providing for short-

term emergency purchases of natural gas, by providing a medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors, by providing a national center for clinical pharmacology, by emphasizing and demanding the use of domestic coal as a means of displacing current foreign energy imports and finally by extending every effort to establish a national program of protection for all Americans against medical expenses.

This is a brief legislative history of Congressman Staggers which in my opinion proves beyond a reasonable doubt of his love for his District, State and Nation and knowing Congressman Staggers as I do I believe that the following poem would be the one that he would adopt at the termination of his life.

I'd like to think when life is done
That I had filled a needed post,
That here and there I'd paid my fare,
With more than idle talk and boast,
That I had taken gifts divine,
The breath of life and manhood fine,
And tried to use them now and then
In service to my fellowmen.

It is with great pleasure and I deem it a sincere honor to present to you our Honored Guest, the Honorable Harley O. Staggers, Sr. ●

PRESIDENT'S RADIO ADDRESS TO THE NATION

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, April 17, our colleague, TOBY MOFFETT of Connecticut, presented the Democratic Party's response to the President's radio address to the Nation.

The Democratic response, Mr. Speaker, was offered under the most unusual circumstances: The broadcast was delayed for 1 hour, while Mr. MOFFETT was in the delivery room at Georgetown University Hospital, where his wife, Myra, gave birth to a baby girl. I am sure we all join in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Moffett on this joyous occasion.

I believe all of my colleagues in the House and in the other body, would benefit from reading Mr. MOFFETT's response. Despite the unique circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the comments delivered by the Congressman from Connecticut comprise a concise and cogent expression of our party's stance on defense policy, on the threat of nuclear war, on the economy, and on the quality of leadership needed in our great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MOFFETT) be included in the RECORD at this point.

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT
REAGAN'S RADIO ADDRESS

(By Congressman TOBY MOFFETT)

Good afternoon. This is Connecticut Congressman Toby Moffett. My Party, the Democrats, has asked me to respond to

President Reagan's address on arms control. This is an important day for me for personal reasons as well. Less than an hour ago, at 1:02 P.M. my wife Myra gave birth to a healthy baby girl. Her name is Mary Ellen.

Mary Ellen Moffett will be 18 years old in the year 2000. As a father of two daughters and as a Member of Congress, I have never been more concerned about the kind of world my children will face.

President Reagan's address was billed as a talk on arms control. It was not a serious talk on arms control. It was a discussion about our enemy, the Soviet Union. We Democrats agree with the President on Afghanistan and Poland. But we don't agree that the Soviet Union is ten feet tall. We don't believe the Soviets are stronger than America. And it serves no useful purpose for a President to keep suggesting that they are.

Candidate Reagan campaigned against the strategic arms control treaty called SALT II. He said that when he got to office, he would meet the Soviet Union at the negotiating table and do better than SALT. He said he would do better than limit arms; he would argue for arms reduction.

The sad fact is that after 16 months in office, the President doesn't have a proposal. He has yet to articulate our interests; how we are threatened and what he is going to do about it.

Not all members of our Party support a nuclear freeze proposal. But the President is wrong when he says that a nuclear freeze would place the United States in a definite position of inferiority.

The United States and the Soviet Union already have enough weaponry to destroy each other many times over. We don't need a policy of more missiles. We need a policy of negotiations, treaties and cooperation to back our Nation and the Soviets off the nuclear precipice.

We can begin, at the very least, by taking another look at SALT II. SALT II would require the Soviet Union to dismantle 308 missiles; the U.S. wouldn't have to dismantle any.

As Admiral Rickover, the father of our nuclear navy said upon his retirement:

"I think it would be the finest thing in the world for the President of the United States to initiate immediately another arms control conference . . . this is a very propitious time, when the military expenses are eating up so much money and using so much of the people's taxes."

Admiral Rickover knows, just as so many business executives and Republican leaders know, that you simply cannot give out \$800 billion in tax cuts and spend \$1.6 trillion on defense over the next five years without choking this economy.

We Democrats thought the President was wrong when he proposed such a program last year. We offered alternatives. We lost. The President won.

Now it is time, in fact past time, to make some changes. The President can begin by being less stubborn and agreeing to back off—to some extent at least—his tax cut and to reduce the size of his military increase.

Last year, when the Reagan program was proposed, its proponents boasted that the gameplan would act "like a rising tide lifting all boats." Now the Secretary of the Treasury says the economy is "dead in the water." What Senator Howard Baker described last year as a "riverboat gamble" has taken a toll that is too much to tolerate.

This program is hurting people, real people. Does the President realize it? Does he really know what he is doing?

They say that back in the 1930's, Ronald Reagan used to broadcast baseball games in a rather interesting manner. He didn't actually attend the games. Instead, young Mr. Reagan would call the games based on statistics fed to him over the telegraph wire.

We Democrats think that President Reagan is doing that same kind of thing these days when he describes the country's economic crisis. He sits in Washington re-

interpreting unemployment statistics, claiming that unemployment has gone down when it has actually gone up.

Indeed, the world of Ronald Reagan—the comfortable world of Pacific Palisades and Barbados—bears little or no relation to the real world. And the words of Ronald Reagan often bear little or no relation to the truth.

We Democrats realize that we have much work to do. It is not enough to stand by and grumble while the economy crumbles. We stand ready to continue in good faith negotiations on the economic crisis.

But we will not see a solution if the President remains stubborn. By his own admission—in his own words—the President is “on the sidelines.”

We need him back in the game. We need him to tell us what he proposes on Social Security and taxes and defense.

In short, it is time for the leading man to lead.

This has been Congressman TOBY MORFETT of Connecticut responding for the Democratic Party to the President's noon-time address to the Nation. ●